The Nation

FOUNDED 1865

Vol. CXIII NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 31, 1921 No. 2930

Contents

EDITORIAL PARAGRAPHS 215

EDITORIALS:

- More Bolshevist Crimes 218
- *McClure's* in Bankruptcy 219
- Konrad Nies 219
- The Proper Sporting Gesture 220

ADOLPH S. OCHS AND HIS *TIMES*. By Oswald Garrison Villard.... 221

FOOD, THE QUAKERS, AND THE BOLSHEVIKS. By Lewis S. Gannett 223

LAW AND NECESSITY IN BISBEE. By George Soule..... 225

MEXICAN FUNDAMENTALS. By E. J. Dillon 227

CONTEMPORARY AMERICAN NOVELISTS. VIII. ROBERT HERRICK. By Carl Van Doren 230

BIGOTRY TURNS TO MURDER. By Charles P. Sweeney..... 232

IN THE DRIFTWAY. By the Drifter 233

CORRESPONDENCE 234

BOOKS:

- The Ends of Man. By Edward Sapir 237
- Not the Last Word. By Jacob Zeitlin 238
- Hail Columbia! By Irita Van Doren 239
- Histoire Comique. By George Soule 240
- Books in Brief 240

DRAMA:

- First Fruits. By Ludwig Lewisohn 241

SUPPLEMENT

INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS SECTION:

- The Economics of Reparation. By J. A. Hobson 243

OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD, EDITOR

ASSOCIATE EDITORS

LEWIS S. GANNETT FREDA KIRCHWEY
ARTHUR WARNER LUDWIG LEWISOHN

ERNEST H. GRUENING, MANAGING EDITOR
CARL VAN DOREN, LITERARY EDITOR

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JOHN A. HOBSON ANATOLE FRANCE H. L. MENCKEN
FRIEDRICH WILHELM FOERSTER ROBERT HERRICK

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—Five dollars per annum postpaid in the United States and Mexico; to Canada, $5.50, and to foreign countries of the Postal Union, $6.00.

THE NATION, 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Cable Address: NATION, New York. Chicago Office: 1170 People's Gas Building. British Agent for Subscriptions and Advertising: Ernest Thurtle, 36 Temple, Fortune Hill, N. W. 4, England.

IT is of small use to talk of disarmament conferences and world peace if Anglo-Irish warfare is to be renewed. We cannot think that the moral opinion of mankind will allow so terrible a proof of utter human incapacity to secure its own well-being. The obstacles to a just settlement are many; none of them is insuperable if those incidents or accidents which kindle inextinguishable fires of passion are avoided. Our great fear is that in an apparent deadlock one side or the other will give the required forty-eight hours' notice and so end the truce. This possibility can be avoided if only the Irish Dail and the British Cabinet will agree to give notice, not forty-eight hours, but twenty-eight days, before terminating the truce. We claim no monopoly of this idea. Something of the sort is being discussed by many Americans. The *World's* dispatch of August 22 shows it is being discussed in London and Dublin. Neither side dares reject it or take the initiative in putting it in effect. Why may not Americans serve as intermediaries? As Americans we are somewhat removed from the heat of the conflict; we are not removed from its ultimate effects. By every obligation of a common humanity we have a right to urge that no reasonable time be denied to the peacemakers. To refuse our plea is an admission not of moral strength but of weakness. The well-being not alone of this generation but of many still unborn, not alone of the Irish and English but of all the innumerable victims of the new world war to which the ancient and unended quarrel of English and Irish assuredly tends, is at stake. At the very least we have a right to ask for time, in the confidence that there is in men a will that makes for righteousness and for peace. In this faith we have cabled our plea to President de Valera and Premier Lloyd George.

AT a time when peace depends on straight thinking and straight speaking, it does not help matters for British and American papers to represent Lloyd George's offer to Ireland as equivalent to what is enjoyed by Canada or Australia. Lloyd George has conceded much; he has not conceded what the dominions enjoy. They can and do (whether wisely or not is another matter) lay protective tariffs against British goods. Ireland has no such right. They fix their own taxes. So may Ireland, but she is required to accept a portion of the imperial debt, and arbitration as to the amount has been rejected. It could be set so high as to leave nothing for a constructive internal program of education and national development. This debt is to be imposed on a nation which believes that from the days of Henry II to the days of the Black and Tans it has found in the British connection only sorrow, exploitation, and depopulation. The provisions for naval and air stations and for recruiting Irish regiments have no parallel in the dominions. They put Irish strength, now alienated, entirely behind the Empire and deny Ireland a foreign policy of her own at the very time the dominions are asserting their right to such a policy as a condition of true self-government. But none of these difficulties from an Irish standpoint is as serious as the British failure to put pressure on the six-county Ulster Parliament in the interest of Irish unity. Irish leaders to their everlasting credit will not try to coerce Ulster by force of arms; they will grant large autonomy; but they have a right to resent a British division of Ireland. This is the position of Home Rulers like Sir Horace Plunkett no less than of Sinn Feiners.

SIGNATURE of the Russo-American agreement for food relief in Russia lifts a load from many a heart. It was hard to understand how men could waste such precious time bargaining over questions of detail in method of control. Now at last the gates are down. Let the food pour in! Before Mr. Hoover lies what may be the greatest opportunity of his life. Here are millions in famine, millions living under a form of government which he detests and under a social system which has ruined some of his own investments. If Mr. Hoover can lead the Western wave of sympathy to those who are hungry in Russia and send his food purely as an expression of humanity and never as an expression of politics, he will carry out the noblest traditions of American generosity and add to his own stature. We believe he will; we believe that criticism of political activity of certain of his agents in the past will put him on his mettle in Russia. The purpose of relief is to save children from starvation, not from bolshevism; let no stain of politics mar the color of America's action. We do not yet know how much Mr. Hoover can give to Russia; if our Government, or other Governments, will give in the same non-political spirit, let them give; and since there are other

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

groups in America and elsewhere who still do not trust Mr. Hoover and prefer to give through the Friends, or directly, let them give too. There is room for all. And may this relief be the first step toward a general resumption of such Russian-American relations as will in some measure atone for the heartless cruelty of our official policy of the past three years.

IT is an open secret in Mexican political circles that the Supreme Court is about to declare the famous Article 27 of the Mexican Constitution not retroactive. President Obregon has repeatedly and explicitly declared that foreign investors need have no fear that he would issue retroactive decrees under this article. His stand has been indorsed by the Senate. That is, all branches of the Mexican Government are approaching agreement upon the one point upon which Secretary Hughes insists, namely, that American investors in oil or other property under previous laws shall not have their holdings confiscated by retroactive legislation. In our judgment the Mexican Government has already met every legitimate requirement. If, however, our Government will feel easier if the decisions of the Mexican Government are embodied in a treaty not precedent to, but automatically conveying, recognition we do not see that the objections Dr. Dillon urges in his article in this issue are wholly relevant. Such a treaty *following, not preceding,* the action of the proper Mexican authorities affords the one practicable way out of a dangerous impasse. It ought to secure not only formal recognition but friendship from the Washington Administration, for Secretary Hughes has repeatedly emphasized his desire to meet Mexico more than half way if only the Mexicans would embody in a treaty their own decision that Article 27 is not retroactive. Such a treaty would leave the interventionists without excuse, give American liberal opinion a chance to be felt against our oil barons, and obtain for the Obregon Government a better opportunity to work out its constructive program. For what they have already done in Mexico and for what they purpose for the future General Obregon and his cabinet deserve the highest praise and all support that citizens of a foreign country can give.

THE wise man comments tentatively on all fiscal legislation until the Senate gets through with it. So it is with the new tax bill passed by the House. On the face of it, that bill will bring a relief this year and next to the extent of some $800,000,000. For this, many thanks. But it is not yet certain that the saving will be real, or the bill itself more than an expensive political gesture. We have no assurance beyond pious hopes that any $800,000,000 can be saved by governmental economies. The Shipping Board's latest demands are not promising; still less promising is the silence of the Administration on the suggestion of further drastic cuts in the army and navy appropriation bill—the one place where large sums can be saved. What shall it profit us to reduce taxes today and have a new deficit tomorrow? As to the way taxes are reduced, there is small evidence of constructive study. Tax bills have to meet two tests: Will they produce revenue? Are they just in their incidence? Under the present order of things the two tests are sometimes conflicting. For example, surtaxes on great incomes seem just; yet apparently they do not raise revenue but scare off capital needed for industrial development into tax-free securities. But it does seem as if a more careful study of inheritance taxes, and possibly of the suggested tax on the value of land exclusive of improvements, might have led to a tax bill more likely to relieve the burdens under which the common man now staggers.

OUR regret at the resignation Miss Julia Lathrop as chief of the Children's Bureau is tempered by the knowledge that she gratifies a desire of some months' standing in laying down the burdens of her office, and still more by our satisfaction over the appointment of Miss Grace Abbott as her successor. Miss Abbott is worthy to succeed Miss Lathrop. Higher praise we cannot give. She possesses the same scientific training, non-bureaucratic temperament, and plain love of folks. She has worked in the Bureau and knows its needs. In appointing her, the President has recognized the need of special rather than political qualification for this type of service. The Bureau as organized by Miss Lathrop has already revealed its unique value; to Miss Abbott will doubtless fall larger opportunities under the Sheppard-Towner Act. But aside from specific service, such women as Miss Lathrop and her successor tend to raise the whole conception of what government may be made to mean in terms of human values.

GROVER CLEVELAND BERGDOLL was just plain slacker, unwilling to fight, and without courage to be a conscientious objector. The men who stood by their anti-war convictions and paid the price have been maligned by association with this wealthy, resourceful, unscrupulous, vulgar egotist. We would not give space to him for his own sake or even because of the astonishing—and rather comic—gullibility of the officers whom he fooled, but the stir about him, culminating in the intemperate report of the majority of the House investigating committee, reflects little credit upon our national sense of proportion. General Ansell may have been easily deceived; but there was no evidence whatever that he was party to the conspiracy as the report alleges. It ought not to be forgotten by the public, still less by former soldiers, that to General Ansell more than to any other one man is due some small measure of reform in our barbarous court-martial procedure and the reduction of hundreds of extreme sentences imposed upon soldiers for trifling offenses. Yet three out of five committee members lightly charge this man with placing gold above the "safety and integrity of the nation." It seems strange that even in the dog days and upon the minds of Congressmen the Bergdoll case should produce such hysteria.

THE Labor Department tells the Senate that it estimates the number of unemployed at 5,735,000. The month of July showed an increase, not a decrease in the number. These figures are relative to the peak of employment in March, 1920, and the Department says that many "wives, girls, and boys have returned to non-gainful work in home or school." Mr. Hoover and some other authorities pooh-pooh these large estimates on the ground that they do not take account of the absorption of unemployed factory workers in smaller non-reporting industries, and especially on the farms. But reports from the farms themselves do not warrant too much optimism. Conditions in the cotton region are worse than in the industrial centers and a correspondent in a New York county writes that the largest farm in that district is said to have from five to twenty applicants for work each day. The Labor Department figures could be cut by more than a million and a half and still the melancholy army of the unemployed would be larger

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than the American army mobilized for the Great War. And unlike that army, the unemployed are not selected with a view to their lack of dependents.

THAT we have escaped more tragic suffering because of this unemployment in the past few months is in the opinion of bankers due to labor's ability to live on its savings, which, contrary to tea-table gossip, did not all go for silk shirts and stockings. Those savings will be pretty well exhausted by winter. What then? For years there have been conservative programs for dealing with this problem worked out by the American Association for Labor Legislation and others. Soup kitchens and hastily improvised workrooms as a means of relieving the burdens of unemployment are a national disgrace, yet our hundred-per-centers have done nothing in the way of planning. Patriotism as a motive to sacrifice is constantly preached to labor: it has not yet appeared as an argument for saving millions of Americans from the agonies that the unemployed and their little children know so well. Yet the whole nation suffers from our improvident unconcern with human well-being.

A CERTAIN Mr. Purdy, postmaster of Minneapolis, according to Postmaster General Hays, is "a bird of a postmaster with a batting average of 1000, although a Democrat." The statement itself we refer to our distinguished contributing editor, that eminent authority on the American language, Mr. H. L. Mencken. It is not our task to dwell lovingly on the portrait of this batting bird whose average exceeds that of Mr. Mencken's townsman, Baltimore's favorite son, Mr. "Babe" Ruth, but rather to inquire the reason which enabled Mr. Purdy to conquer the inherent limitations of Democratic inefficiency. It is in brief his love of music. He has greatly improved the morale and efficiency of the Minneapolis post office by introducing a phonograph with records to rest the nerves and enliven the spirits of the night workers. Jazz is only resorted to at the end of the night. Our musical editor suspends judgment until he sees a specimen program, but we are for the scheme. When a New England city hired a band to play in the parks to make the unemployed forget their troubles it somehow left us cold, but Mr. Purdy convinces us entirely. The future of music as the ally of efficiency is secure. The deficits of our great orchestras need no longer alarm their supporters and the last lingering opposition of the American Legion to Mr. Kreisler's music can be removed now that music makes for morale among the workers and prevents bolshevism among the unemployed.

PETER KARAGEORGEVICH, dying peacefully of pleurisy while still titular king of Serbia, sets a new record in the strange and bloody story of his house. His grandfather—the "Black George" who gave his name to the line—was the cattle dealer patriot who led Serbia's war of liberation in Napoleonic days and ruled as Prince of Serbia from 1808 to 1812. He lost the princeship to a rival line, and was murdered in 1817. His second son, Alexander Karageorgevich, was prince from 1842 to 1858, but was expelled for subservience to Austria, and died in exile, under sentence of 20 years' imprisonment imposed *in contumaciam*. Peter himself had a vivid career. Educated in Hungary, Russia, and France, he fought through the Franco-Prussian War as an officer in the French army, was three times captured and as many times escaped. For years he lived the life of a prince in Paris, with occasional Balkan campaigns as interludes. The midnight palace revolution of 1903, in which the old king, the queen, two of her brothers, two cabinet ministers, and some fifty other persons were murdered, brought the line of Karageorgevich back to the Serbian throne. Peter lived to see the Balkan Wars and the European War more than double his kingdom. His son Alexander has been virtually king for some years. Peter belonged rather to the comic opera period of Balkan history than to the twentieth century.

LELAND STANFORD University is fortunate in its Hoover War Collection. It is possible that nowhere else in the world will the future historian find so complete a documentary history of the war, though the Germans and English are also at work on a great scale. Mr. Hoover has deposited at Leland Stanford the files of the Commission for Relief in Belgium. His initial gift of $50,000, since enlarged, and his name and reputation, have made possible nearly complete collections of war-time publications of most of the belligerent countries, the official propaganda material of the various delegations at the Peace Conference, files of daily and weekly papers and of the publications of propaganda societies ranging from the bitterest of imperialist groups to the French Confederation of Labor and the British No-Conscription Fellowship, what is said to be the only set of reports of the "Hungarian Soviet Parliament" (whatever that may be) in existence, bolshevik newspapers, trench papers, posters, the Belgian secret journals, etc. It seems to lack the extremely important publications of the British Labor Party and of the war-time international socialist congresses, but the gaps will doubtless be filled in time. Mr. Hoover's initiative and the energy of the directors of the collection, Professors Adams and Lutz, have given America an assemblage of material which can hardly be outranked by the great collections of Europe, sometimes less catholic in selection.

MANKIND lives on metaphors and metaphors become myths. A trope disguises a personality and a picturesque phrase can drive a nation mad. Thence arises the supreme value of such a mind and method as Lytton Strachey's. He is cool and wary. He rips the myth asunder. Thus he sees, in his latest work, not Victoria the Good, not the mythical Queen of Tennyson's dedications, but a small, stubborn lady of limited intelligence gathering family mementoes like any widow in Bloomsbury. The course of our national life in America would move more smoothly and sanely if we could gain the services of a myth-shattering intelligence. The figure of Roosevelt, for instance, threatens through the exercise of the mythopœic faculty to become disastrous in its influence. His bustling energy is mistaken for heroic action, his many-sided shallowness for wisdom and learning, his blatant militarism for the necessary defense of a perpetually endangered country. If we cannot have a Strachey to expose the myth, we could at least subject the existing biographies to the skilful treatment recently applied by Francis Hackett in the *New Republic* to a "Life of Cecil Rhodes." The author of that life sought to turn Rhodes into a mythical personage. But now and then he blunders into truth. He shows the heel of Achilles. These passages Mr. Hackett excerpts and quotes, with the result that the myth fades, Achilles disappears, and a vast heel remains.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

More Bolshevist Crimes

SPECULATION as to whether the Soviet Government will or will not survive is one of the most delightful of indoor pastimes—particularly for our American editorial writers. We ourselves have our serious doubts as to its permanency quite aside from any economic issues; for we cannot but question the survival of any government which admittedly holds itself in power by duress, by force, and by suppression. Yet even in that it strangely resembles some other European governments, and, as with everything else that has occurred in Russia, there has been the most abominable exaggeration about the number of imprisonments and executions. We are quite clear in our own minds, too, that any government in Russia satisfactory to the men who control the present world organization would be far more bloodthirsty and violent than has been the Soviet Government—witness Horthy in Hungary, witness what has been going on in Rumania, witness the pogroms in Poland. But for some reasons if it ever comes we shall receive with profoundest regret the news of the fall or retirement of the two ablest rulers in the world today—Lenin and Trotzky—and the chief of those reasons is the policy pursued by them in foreign affairs. Some of the facts in regard thereto we are setting forth here for the benefit of such editorial writers as are not so blind they will not see. It is a record to be proud of, for it has been marked by ideality, by extraordinary generosity, frequently by a genuine living up to the doctrine of dealing with others as one would be dealt by. Yet it has been deliberately and completely overshadowed by the myriads of lies about Russia such as that of the nationalization of women.

First and foremost comes the treatment of China. In March, 1920, the Moscow Government sent a communication to the Chinese Government expressing that deep sense of outrage which every honest human being must feel at the crimes committed against China by the great capitalistic Powers, and offering to annul all its treaties with China, and to renounce all the special privileges for Russia and Russians wrung from the Chinese by the Government of the Czars. It urged China to resume negotiations for the restoration to her of the Chinese Eastern Railway, and for the cancelation of the protocol of 1901, and it announced that the Soviet Government would give up all the extra-territorial rights enjoyed by Russians and Russian missionaries in China. More than that, Lenin offered to cancel the rest of the Boxer indemnity, and all the mining rights held in China by Russians. That was not all. As a special act of reparation Lenin offered to present to China without charge the great Russian tea factories at Hankow. It is true that there was a string attached to all of this. What was it? It was that the Chinese people should have complete freedom to determine their own system of government. How base, how shocking!

At the time the London *Times* correspondent in China reported that that country would gladly accept this offer so unparalleled in the relations of great nations. But something happened. More than a year has passed, and China has not yet been able to signify its assent. The Peking Government on September 17 gave out a statement in which it said that "China must follow the example of the Allies regarding trade representation with Russia," and in December, 1920, inspired dispatches declared that the Chinese Government "does not desire to proceed further toward formal recognition of the Moscow Government than Great Britain, and that its decisions will be influenced largely by those of the British Government . . ." On May 7 last the Peking Foreign Office declared that "no formal negotiations have been opened with the Soviet Government. China's attitude at present is neutral. As long as our frontiers are not violated we will remain spectators." In other words, under Allied pressure, China has not dared to act.

When it comes to Persia, the facts are clear. There the wicked soviet leaders put an end to the Czar's policy of dividing Persia with Great Britain and have driven England out. And there, too, they renounced every one of the extra-territorial privileges which made against the complete freedom of Persia, with the result that on July 26 last Lord Curzon officially admitted that the Persian Government had decided that it preferred salvation from Moscow rather than from London. Before advancing soviet forces the British troops fled so hastily that they blew up bridges which the British had themselves constructed; the whole British military and civilian structure in Persia has collapsed, and with it the hope of Persian oil. Previously, on February 26 last, Russia signed a treaty (published in *The Nation* on May 11) immutably renouncing all of the Russian Imperial Government's policy of force, and affirming the scandalous purpose of the present Russian Government "to see the Persian people independent, flourishing, and freely controlling the whole of its possessions." Worse than that, Lenin turned over all Russian properties in Persia, such as railways, quays, goods, stores, steamers, barges, *chaussées*, telegraph and telephone lines, the port of Enzeli, with stores, stations, powerhouses, etc., free of cost. Had any one else drafted it the world would have said that no more admirable or high-minded or just treaty could have been written. And the same high praise may be conferred upon the treaty between Russia and Afghanistan returning to that country the Afghanistan frontier districts stolen by Russia—a treaty based upon "the principle of justice and the free expression of the will of the people." As an evidence of good-will the Soviets are giving yearly a free subsidy to Afghanistan of one million rubles in gold or silver. They are building for it a telegraph line, free of charge, from Kushka via Herat and Kandahar to Kabul, and are supplying technical and other specialists to the Afghan Government—of course for some devilish schemes of their own.

Rack our brains as we may, we cannot recall an instance in the history of the noble Allied Powers, now so outraged at the Soviet Government, in which they have negotiated any similar treaty with any other Power on earth, big or little, without exacting blood money and territorial or economic concessions for any favors they might have conferred. We can think only of our own return of the Boxer indemnity as an exception to the rule of uniform imperialist aggression. Yet, were we to delve further into the diplomatic history of these bolshevik outlaws we might unearth other treaties almost as strange. The territorial and economic concessions freely made to the little Baltic states and to Poland in the larger interest of peace are but the most flagrant instances—to say nothing of the pressure brought to bear upon Turkey, which did far more to help the Armenians than all the noisy sympathy of the Allies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

McClure's in Bankruptcy

THE announcement of a receivership for *McClure's* recalls rather than signalizes a journalistic, and coincidentally a civic tragedy. For the *McClure's* that dedicated itself to the public good and thereby achieved a commanding position in the magazine world perished long ago. Together with its fellow crusaders for a truer democracy, the *American Magazine* as edited by John S. Phillips, *Collier's* under the guidance of Norman Hapgood, the old *Everybody's*, and *Hampton's*, which has ceased to exist even in name, it came under the control of the forces of predatory privilege with which it had been battling.

The history of *McClure's*, now nearly thirty years old, divides itself roughly into three decades. Founded in 1893 it provided a sharp contrast to the staid higher-priced monthlies. Its low price, at first fifteen cents, then ten, was an auspicious innovation made possible chiefly because of its connection with the newspaper syndicate established by Mr. S. S. McClure. The journalistic influence was apparent and to the magazine's advantage. In the parlance of a later day it was "live." The novelty of the hour, the contemporary discoveries in science and geographical exploration, were ably set forth. Sir Robert Ball and Simon Newcomb wrote astronomical articles, Nansen and Peary recorded their polar adventures, Professor Langley and Santos-Dumont their pioneering in aviation. In the field of essay and history Carl Schurz, Ferdinand Brunetière, Edward Everett Hale, Brooks Adams, Hamlin Garland, George Edward Woodberry, Bliss Perry, and Captain Mahan were contributors. Ida Tarbell published in it her life of Lincoln and Charles A. Dana his reminiscences. But it was in fiction that the early *McClure's* excelled. William Dean Howells, Bret Harte, Octave Thanet, Ian MacLaren, F. Marion Crawford, Margaret Deland, Thomas Hardy, Gilbert Parker, Morgan Robertson, Conan Doyle, Sarah Orne Jewett, Robert Barr, Stanley Weyman, Israel Zangwill, added their luster to it. Robert Louis Stevenson's "St. Ives," Anthony Hope's "Rupert of Hentzau," Kipling's "Captains Courageous" and "Kim" appeared in serial form.

But it was in November, 1902, that *McClure's* began recording real history. In that number Ida Tarbell's epoch-making "History of Standard Oil" first appeared. The movement was not without significance. Roosevelt, the feared and hated of reactionaries, had through the accident of McKinley's death just become President. The devotion to public service, the reenthronement of democratic shibboleths with which the Colonel was associated in the public mind, were fully reflected in *McClure's* and its contemporaries. Next came Lincoln Steffens's "Shame of the Cities," which bared the profound crookedness of our municipal politics in conjunction with big business. The railroads were "muckraked" fore and aft to such good effect that resulting drastic regulation ended their heyday of limitless control. The spotlight was mercilessly turned on nearly every phase of big business's corruption of government. Nor was this criticism merely of what is now glibly termed the "destructive" kind. The heroes of the new order, La Follette, Judge Ben Lindsey, Joseph W. Folk, were duly extolled. And the magazines which thus dissected the established order grew overnight in prestige, influence, and circulation. No libraries excluded them; no "patriotic" groups denounced them. *McClure's* fiction soon reached a standard never excelled since. O. Henry's and Jack London's greatest short stories appeared; Harris Merton Lyon, Mark Twain, Joseph Conrad, Willa Cather, Rex Beach, and Booth Tarkington were regular contributors. The magazine was brilliant, vivid, human, and militantly American in the fine sense that 100 per cent Americanism has since replaced and destroyed. It was *McClure's* Periclean age.

The control passed into other hands, as *McClure's* entered its third decade. Its public was now treated to such sterling pieces as "Buttons: A Romance of American Industry" and "Tin Canners: The Story of the Greatest Industry of the Age and the Men Who Built It." The magazine was "constructive." It ran "Salary $100,000 a Year—a Remarkable Series of Articles on the Men Who Have Accomplished Creative Tasks of Modern Industry," by Edward Mott Woolley, and not content to stop here, but to demonstrate its complete expiation, began a new series of "booster" articles, "The Fame of the Cities." The shame of *McClure's* was complete.

After 1914, in an effort to stem its diminishing prestige and circulation which even a money-bag ownership will not endure forever, the magazine evidently tried to appropriate George M. Cohan's wisdom that "many a bum show has been saved by the American flag," and enfolded itself in the red, white, and blue. Cleveland Moffett, an accessory of the magazine since its first days when he was writing nimbly on topics as varied as "How the Circus is Put Up and Taken Down," "Pinkerton Detective Stories," "The Poisonous Snakes of India," and "When Mountains Blow Their Heads Off," now eulogized "The War Beautiful." The war seemed to offer a new lease on life and *McClure's* mobilized from cover to cover. It emerged from the war about as well off as other victors. It passed to a new editorial dynasty, reduced its price, and Mr. Herbert Kaufman, poet laureate of success, written with a capital S crossed by two parallel bars rampant, tried to infuse the magic of some of his verbal incantations into the carcass. Vain attempt. The soul of *McClure's* had long since sped. It was a good magazine when it had one. *Hic jacet.*

Konrad Nies

ANGRY and efficient Americanizers cannot be expected to stop to remember the true history of our national past or to admit that the cultivation and use of a people's spiritual past is precisely what marks a fruitful and serene as opposed to a militant and bloody patriotism. "French," says the hundred per cent lady, "is such a pretty language"—a characterization hardly calculated to please the countrymen of Molière and Hugo—while she approvingly observes State legislatures passing silly laws concerning the teaching of a tongue which, since the landing of the German Pilgrims in 1683, has echoed and embodied every phase of that national history and character which she and her like desire to honor.

We are led to make these fairly obvious reflections by the news that on August 10 Konrad Nies died in San Francisco shortly before completing his sixtieth year. For many years Nies was generally acknowledged to be the chief poet using the German language in this country. To many educated Americans this statement will, unhappily, bring up the vision of a slack versifier presiding at Turner celebrations and Liederfests. Nothing could be further

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the truth. Prior to the year 1912, which may roughly be used to mark the emergence of the modern revival in American poetry, it might have been not unreasonably urged that Nies represented at once the most powerful and the most finished poetical force active among us. He was no modernist in form. He shared with the Munich school and the Parnassiens of France a steady predilection for the firm line, the exact rhyme, the sonorous stanza. But into his admirably wrought couplets and quatrains and sonnets he poured the intricate passions and perceptions of a modern soul, so that many of the poems in his several volumes, "Funken," "Aus Westlichen Weiten," "Rosen im Schnee," unite, to an extraordinary degree, faultless workmanship with inner glow, the peace of beauty with the troubling eloquence of the heart. He was, like Vachel Lindsey, an admirable reader of his own works. In these readings he rendered strikingly that double character of his verse of which he was quite aware, and many lovers of poetry throughout the country will recall his magnificent reading of "Die Rache der Wälder," in which, among the earliest anywhere, he protested against deforestation.

The ultimate significance of Konrad Nies is, of course, that he was a good poet. It is, at this moment of time, worth emphasizing in addition that he was an American poet, and that he was an American poet not by the mere accident of residence, but through the fulfilment and natural extension of a literary and cultural tradition which arose only sixty-three years after that Pilgrim landing at Plymouth which we have just been celebrating.

Franz Daniel Pastorius, the leader of the German Pilgrims, was himself a poet. A poet, like the contemporary New Englanders, of course, strictly of his time and persuasion. But he was not given over wholly to hymnology. In his "Deliciae Hortenses" there is a shy, quaint, attractive pastoral strain. He celebrates the flowers and plants of the New World; he has a touch of humor; he raises his voice in earnest indignation against the horrors of human slavery. His followers and immediate successors were more purely religious bards than himself. But they were nearly all learned men and united with the tradition of the Lutheran hymn the classicizing tendencies of seventeenth century German poetry. The tradition thus started persisted vigorously. Broadsheets, pamphlets, and books continued to be published in and near Philadelphia. The eighteenth century brought in the Anacreontic strain; the Revolution introduced ruder balladry and song and German Colonial and Tory Hessian fought in lampoon and rude satire as did their English-speaking brothers in arms.

The habits of the fathers were never abandoned. There is no decade of our national history that did not produce its German writing poets. This literature continued to be largely one of minor poets and gentle strains. But it did not in this respect differ so greatly from its contemporary work in English. A powerful impetus was given by the coming of the German revolutionaries of 1848 and German poetry in America continued for many years to gain in volume, spiritedness, and beauty of form. The newspapers, moreover, were more hospitable to it than their English neighbors, readers were never as few as might be supposed, and toward the end of the nineteenth century the American poetical movement in German with Konrad Nies as its chief would have borne favorable comparison with that headed by Aldrich, Gilder, Stedman, and Woodberry.

The Proper Sporting Gesture

WHETHER or not the tour on behalf of devastated France is itself devastated as a result of Mlle. Lenglen's default in the tennis tournament at Forest Hills remains to be seen. Since she is a visitor who has a right to expect that the laws of hospitality be observed, it is proper to accept her reason for defaulting and to refuse to dispute (on the ground that the date of the tournament had been set long ahead) the statement attributed to her or to her friends, that she considered it a bit unfair to have to play in a crucial match two days after her arrival. The generous and sportsmanlike course is to admit unqualifiedly that Mlle. Lenglen was incapacitated and to await with eagerness the return match which will undoubtedly be worth watching.

Entirely apart, however, from the question of hospitality, the curious and interesting fact of the whole matter is that if Mlle. Lenglen had done what was obviously difficult and perhaps impossible for her to do, the situation would have been almost entirely reversed. If she had been willing or able to play out the set, to take the thorough beating which was evidently to be hers, the gallery would have established its own alibis for her, Mrs. Mallory would have received no credit whatever for her brilliant playing, and the French star would have twinkled more like a diamond in the sky than ever. That she did not do so, for whatever reason, is distinctly her misfortune. The other course for her then, granting this bad luck, was to shake hands prettily, wave a deprecating hand to the gallery, and retire in good order. Such are the rules of the game, according to the Anglo-Saxon tradition in sportsmanship, which demands first that the game be played as well and as hard as possible, and second that defeat be accepted gracefully. The theory behind this last is that a true sportsman cares more for the game than the winning of it. Whether or not this is true, the act of losing gracefully, in those sections of the world where this particular tradition exists, has distinctly utilitarian aspects.

A year or so ago some visitors and their team had at the close of the argument in a woman's intercollegiate debate every reason to expect a favorable decision. The ominous silence of the audience at large showed that they expected defeat. But the judges' pronouncement of victory for the home team was hardly out of the announcer's mouth before the small group of visitors was on its feet cheering the winners. Pooh! says the cynic who hates to hear women cheer anyway: a gesture, and an affected one at that! A gesture it undoubtedly was, and affected it may have been. But the effect on the audience was electrical, and it is safe to say that the losers in that particular game received more glory than the winners, whether they deserved it or not. There is no question about it: the tendency of the gallery is to be with the under dog; when he behaves as fashion demands its support is generous and inevitable. At the Mallory-Lenglen affair, because it is unpleasant to win a dubious victory, the gallery quite evidently considered the under dog to be Mrs. Mallory —and elevated its thumbs for her forthwith. The only really safe way to stop short in the midst of a game is to be so badly injured as to have to be carried from the field; the requirement may be heroic but the gallery's approval is assured.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Adolph S. Ochs and His *Times*

By OSWALD GARRISON VILLARD

THE twenty-fifth anniversary of his control of the New York *Times* has given Adolph S. Ochs an opportunity to review the period of his ownership and to set forth the journalistic success he has achieved. The *Times* was a decrepit, losing proposition when he took hold of it, running behind $1,000 a day and having a circulation of only 18,900. Today its circulation is 352,528; its advertising has increased from 2,227,196 lines to 23,447,395. It does an annual gross business of $15,000,000 and Mr. Ochs is especially proud to set forth that of its annual gross income only three per cent has gone to the owners, the rest having been "plowed into" the property for its betterment. Regarded simply as a business venture it is an extraordinary achievement, comparing most favorably with similar feats in purely mercantile lines, all the more so because, on account of the lack of funds, Mr. Ochs had to carry it largely with borrowed money until the property began to earn a profit. He had a clear vision of what he wanted to achieve and had the faith to stick to it against great odds. And Mr. Ochs's frankness is not limited to statistics of circulation and advertising. He has laid bare once more the details of the ownership with a view, probably, to putting an end forever to the whispered charges that there was British capital in the *Times*. There are only American owners and he and his family hold 64 per cent of the paper's stock. Nobody in journalistic circles ever believed this gossip as to foreign control. In the first place Mr. Ochs's business rectitude is beyond question; in the second place the *Times* is naturally so pro-English that the British would never have had to pay money to it even had its owner been venal; in the third place during our late hysteria it was the fashion to charge any newspaper whose views one did not like with being in the pay of the other side. It is true that some rich Wall Street men helped Mr. Ochs at times, notably in the matter of the bonds of the Times Building. But it is false to deduce from that certain characteristics of his paper; it would have taken precisely the course it has followed had Mr. Ochs never needed to borrow a penny from anybody. No journalist has ever questioned the fact that it was Mr. Ochs's paper or that it bore the stamp of his personality.

During these twenty-five years the *Times* has been clean and enterprising, able and shrewd. Not that it has lived up to the suggestion in its motto of printing only the news fit for publication—witness recently its debasement in the Stillman scandal—nor has it printed all the news. It has simply purveyed all the news which especially interested its owners and editors and, as far as possible, only that which supported its editorial viewpoint. But it has rendered a genuine public service in increasing the volume of news and especially of foreign news. Mr. Ochs's greatest contribution to our journalism has been his faith in news as a sales asset. Many men in a similar position have wanted to gamble on future success by filling their columns with original news, but since the time of the younger James Gordon Bennett perhaps no one except Mr. Ochs and the Chicago *Tribune* has dared to do so. Others would have taken much more than three per cent of their earnings and have put back far less. Like the Chicago *Daily News*, Mr. Ochs has supplemented the Associated Press service with extremely costly special dispatches and letters. Newspaper men are like sheep; if one hits upon a rotogravure supplement, or a comic "ribbon," or a Sunday comic section, and it is successful, everybody else strives to follow suit. Hearst's financial success had by 1898 debased a good part of the American press; Mr. Ochs's increase of the volume of his news and the number of his news departments (notably in the commercial field) has had a beneficial influence upon the entire press of the country. It has led many thousands to read the *Times* to whom its opinions were anathema. Particularly worth while and public-spirited has been the cabling of important speeches and documents in full, notably the utterances of Lloyd George, even when extensive summaries were carried by the Associated Press.

Full credit must also be given to Mr. Ochs for keeping his advertising columns clean and for the excellence of his auxiliary publications. His rotogravure supplements are still the best, while his Sunday magazine is in a class by itself as to its technical make-up and its half-tone illustrations. His Midweek Pictorial and his Current History Magazine deserve their success. Moreover, his refusal to stoop to a comic supplement when it would indubitably have largely increased his circulation during his critical days ought long to be remembered to his credit. If all journalists are to be measured simply by the superficial outward aspects of a daily and by the yardstick of business success, there can be no question that Mr. Ochs has earned a place in any journalistic Hall of Fame.

But as man cannot live by bread alone, so no newspaper can or should be finally judged by the amount either of its revenues or of the number of its advertising lines or of the yards of news it prints a day or of the multitude of its readers. If these were the sole tests Hearst would rank high on at least two counts. There are fortunately other tests, above all the ethical one. True, the facile historians of journalism, notably two recent ones, James Melvin Lee and George Henry Payne, have preferred not to use that measuring stick. Yet any definitive survey of the rise and fall of American journalism must apply that test above all others. It must ask last of all what were the returns of the counting room but must first inquire what ideals a given journal upheld, what moral aims it pursued, what national and international policies it championed, what was the spirit of fair play and justice which actuated it, and above all on whose side and under whose banner it fought. The minute one begins to measure and to value Mr. Ochs's *Times* from these points of view the whole picture he has drawn of his achievement changes profoundly for the worse.

Mr. Ochs, I have no doubt whatever, sincerely believes that when he says his is an "independent newspaper" that "tolerates no tampering with the news, no coloring, no deception," and that it has attained a high reputation "for the fulness, trustworthiness, and impartiality of its news service," he paints a just picture of his daily. It would be pleasant to be able to agree with him, but the truth lies elsewhere. The *Times* is no more independent than it is swayed by a desire to be just. It is a class paper, pure and simple, as much so as the *Call*, or any labor journal. Its news can pass only the quantitative and no qualitative test.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

No journal has exceeded it in disseminating falsehoods, misrepresentations, and half truths during the unparalleled era of wholesale lying in which the whole world has lived since 1914. Just how shameless, for instance, it has been in its treatment of Russian news has been repeatedly set forth both by *The Nation* and the *New Republic* without any refutation. To excuse it, as some try to do, by placing the responsibility upon the Associated Press is ridiculous. In the first place many of the worst fabrications have come from special correspondents; in the second place no newspaper is compelled to print the Associated Press news it receives; in the third place Mr. Ochs is, with one exception, probably the most influential director in the Associated Press and could, if he tried to, stop the kind of reporting which made his newspaper report within a comparatively brief period that Petrograd had fallen six times, been on the verge of capture three times more, been burned to the ground twice, been in absolute panic twice and in revolt against the Bolsheviks on six different occasions—all without the slightest foundation in fact. Only in the columns of Hearst could one find a record to equal this.

Surely, if any rulers were ever justified in excluding correspondents from their country, Lenin and Trotzky are in shutting out those of the *Times*. For the *Times* is read in Moscow and these two men know well that the *Times's* special correspondents are primarily propagandists and not only in so far as Russia is concerned. These correspondents, to judge them by their work, exist primarily to defend a point of view and that interpretation of society for which the *Times* exists. Again, Lenin and Trotzky, if they are like other students of the times, know that the *Times* rarely if ever apologizes when it has committed a wrong or done an injury. Take the case of Jane Addams for one. With what abuse did not the *Times* cover her, one of the noblest of our women, because she told the simple truth that the Allied troops were often given liquor or drugs before charging across No Man's Land. Yet when the facts came out at the hands of Sir Philip Gibbs and others not one word of apology was ever forthcoming. Not even the dead are safe at its hands. Endless are the letters of correction and reproof which go to the *Times*, never to appear in print—for lack of space doubtless, but justice is denied again and again. Certainly the protestant has no standing in the *Times's* court whatever, unless he is of the elect and the powerful and on the popular side. Before the god of wealth the *Times* ever bows down. It has just said, with almost incredible callousness and heartlessness, that "a certain degree of unemployment is curative of many social disorders. It is the argument to the stomach which becomes necessary when the appeal to reason and industrial morality fails"—let the working dogs eat cake if they have no bread! But how it bleats if Congress or the tax-gatherer squeeze the rich to whom it toadies day by day, year in year out.

At its doors have knocked in vain for help those who seek fundamentally to better the world, woman suffragists, land reformers, tax reformers, the toiling masses, all who strive internationally for peace and good will on earth, anybody who could ever be remotely suspected of endangering the existing order or of threatening capitalism. For not even the Jews, Mr. Ochs's race, has it pleaded as ardently as have others, apparently for fear lest it be further decried and criticized as a Jew paper; how else can one explain its refusal to print the British report on the Polish pogroms save as paid advertising? As a teacher of race hatred it is unsurpassed; it leaves no stone unturned to make clear its belief that there are two kinds of American citizen—the privileged and the disadvantaged—the blacks and the whites. What has the *Times* left undone since 1917 to spread bitter hatred of great classes of our citizens? No, no; it may count its success in dollars and cents, but never in moral values. It may well praise itself as the defender of the *status quo* as much as it pleases, but if anybody should declare that it is a great champion of popular rights, a journalistic John Bright, an incessant pleader for the lowly and the oppressed, an invariable and ardent defender of all who seek to rise, a never-failing protagonist of the true spirit of American liberty, his tongue would cleave to his mouth forever. On the East Side, where live lowly masses of the Jewish people, the race of Jesus, the *Times* is not worshiped. They, like *The Nation*, know Mr. Ochs to be honest, they admire his usual modesty, his ability, his business sagacity, his total lack of all notoriety seeking, his aloofness from politics and personal aggrandizement, his skill, his courage, but it is not to him that they turn when their skies are overcast and the God of his fathers seems to have veiled His face to His wanderers of the earth.

What the New York *Times* should be, perhaps what Mr. Ochs means it to be, is an American *Manchester Guardian*. The difference is the difference between Chattanooga and Manchester. The *Guardian*, too, has just had a jubilee; there the chorus of praise was universal; there no one ever questions the responsibility and reliability of news correspondents; there is a great open-minded, noble-spirited editorial page keen for every wrong, eager for advance and reform, champion of the workers as often as of the rich, buttressed upon inviolable principles of human liberty which *it* never abandoned, not even in the craze of the war; above all else never silent in the presence of sin by whomsoever committed. No, it is the London *Morning Post* with which the *Times* must be contrasted, but here also the *Times* fails; Toryism is better served, more ably defended in London. Both deserve well of every Gary and every Coolidge, of every Curzon and every Bonar Law. In them the existing broken-down order has its staunchest defenders. If the world is out of sorts, it is because of them, their kith and kin. It will progress not because of but in spite of them and their fulminations. Certainly in this country since the *Times* has kept silent or defended the persecution of the Socialists, the prostitution of the Constitution, the trampling under foot of the sacred rights of individual liberty which still goes on, it is idle to expect that it will serve or preserve the spirit of the America of Lowell and Wendell Phillips and Sumner and Emerson and Abraham Lincoln.

Contributors to This Issue

GEORGE SOULE is an authority on American labor problems.

E. J. DILLON, the veteran English writer and correspondent, has made notable contributions in the discussion of Mexican affairs.

CHARLES P. SWEENEY is a New York newspaperman and the author of an article on Bigotry in the South which appeared in *The Nation* a few years ago.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Food, the Quakers, and the Bolsheviks

By LEWIS S. GANNETT

PAYOK is the first word you learn in Russia. The I. W. W. boys translate it phonetically as pie-card. To be exact it is not the pie-card but the pie: it is the ration. There are three main classes of *payok* today: the "diplomatic," the "demi-dip," and the ordinary. Distinguished foreign visitors (which means almost all foreign visitors) get the "dip"; responsible workers (which means most workers in government offices and factory workers in factories which show a high rate of productivity) get the "demi-dip"; and other workers the ordinary *payok*. Peasants feed themselves out of their own crops. In addition to the *payok* most office workers receive a small salary —often the equivalent, in market prices, of a pound of white bread or half a dozen eggs a month. These salaries were fixed in the days when money had been almost abolished as a medium of exchange; one aspect of the new economic policy is that they are to be raised tenfold. But that involves printing much more paper money, and has to await the advent of a large supply of paper. Today factory workers can exchange a small percentage of their product directly for food.

But a *payok* in the kitchen is very different from a *payok* on paper. A *payok* on paper includes eggs, and fresh vegetables, and fats, and sundry things which do not materialize on the table because supplies are lacking. The "commandant" of a house gets as much of the *payok* of the occupants of that house as she can, but even in Moscow in June and July, when I was there, it ran rather short of the schedule, and the famine is likely to make it do so even more. Here, for instance, are the three classes of *payok* as they were scheduled on paper for June of this year in Moscow, and the actual diplomatic *payok*, which in addition to being the best on paper probably came nearer to realization than the others:[1]

	On paper			
	Ordinary	Demi-dip	Dip	Actual dip
Gray flour or bread	..	10	10	10
Black flour or bread	30	35	35	35
Meat	7.5	15	30	10
Fat	1	2.5	5	2
Grits	5	7.5	15	12
Cheese, etc.	..	2.5	5	..
Sugar	1	2.5	5	4
Macaroni, etc.	1	2.5	5	..
Salt	1	1	1.5	1.5
Vegetables	30	30	45	10
Dried fruit	..	2.5	5	3
Condiments	..	1	2	1
Tea	.25	.25	.25	.25
Coffee	..	.6	1.25	1.25
Soap	1.25	1.25	3	..
Eggs	..	30	60	..

That is not much food for a month. In practice the cheese, macaroni, eggs, and soap fell out entirely that month even for the most favored, and the meat, fat, and vegetables were sadly reduced. Even bread is sometimes missing for days at a time; and in Petrograd and many other cities conditions were much worse than in Moscow. This black bread which makes up the major sustenance of the ration is a curious soggy composition, said to contain all the elements necessary for a complete diet. After some experience with it, I can believe that; one finds almost everything in it. When a day or two stale it is not so bad; most foreigners have to become gradually adjusted to it. Certain groups receive extra rations: Night workers get a slight supplement; the sick are supposed to, and often do, get eggs, extra cheese, meat, grits, and better flour. And the children are the best fed of all. When rations are short, the workers are skimped before the children.

But even the children get scant enough rations. Statistics are dull, and it is hard to translate a "pound of bread" into concrete terms of crust and nutriment, but there is no other way of telling the unvarnished tale. In April and May of this year the actual food rations received in Moscow by (A) normal children (three to twelve years old), and (B) by under-nourished children were as follows (except for eggs, in Russian pounds):

	APRIL		MAY	
	(A)	(B)	(A)	(B)
Bread	20	20	16.9	22.5
Meat	7	12	10	12
Grits	7.5	10	8.5	10
Special grain	3.75	2.5	3	3
Sugar	2	2	1	1.5
Dried fruit	2	..	1	1.5
Dried vegetables	2.75	3	..	..
Potato flour	..	..	.25	.5
Fat	1	1.4	.5	1.4
Coffee	.1	.5	.4	.5
Salt	1	1	1	1
Eggs	16	30	?	?

This works out, in April to about 1.3 and 1.5 English pounds per day for the normal and under-nourished children respectively, and in May to 1.2 and 1.5. In June the ration was slightly worse. It was hoped that the ration could be raised this summer, but the drought that killed the winter wheat along the Volga killed that hope too.

The most serious shortage, obviously, is in milk and fats—and in soap. Everybody is short of soap in Russia. Despite that people are remarkably clean—far cleaner than were the French peasants in the villages just behind the lines during the war. The cleanliness campaigns waged by the Health Commissariat must have been extraordinarily effective. Many of the children's institutions about Moscow wash their sheets with wood ashes instead of soap; an effete American is amazed at the resultant cleanliness—but soap would be easier. Hence the Quakers, who were first among Western relief organizations to begin work in Russia, just as, two years ago, they were first to feed children in the Central Empires, have very largely concentrated their efforts thus far on soap and fat and milk.

The Quakers are, to be sure, distributing supplies for other organizations as well. They seemed to be the only outside relief organization in which the Soviet Government had confidence; the Bolsheviks had come to suspect that agents of relief organizations might be camouflaged political propagandists. Home pressure apparently led the American Relief Administration and American Red Cross, long so apathetic to conditions in Russia, to seek an easy

[1] The figures, except for eggs, are given in Russian pounds. A Russian pound is about seven-eighths of an English pound.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

way of doing something, even before the Gorki famine appeal. The A. R. A. turned over to the Quakers $100,000 worth of condensed milk and vegetable oil—eight carloads of the former and six of the latter, goods that had apparently been battering about Europe for two years or more; and the A. R. C. gave $50,000 worth of medicine and clothing and hinted at the possibility of more. The British Quakers, together with the British Save the Children Fund, raised about $250,000 for relief work in Russia, and the American Friends Service Committee, with its allied organizations, has done the rest.

These funds and supplies were, when I was in Russia two months ago, being utilized in Moscow alone. Work has since begun in Petrograd, where the faces on the streets show the mark of hunger far more vividly than in Moscow. Distribution of supplies provided by the Jewish Joint Distribution Committee has also begun from Minsk, and one of the Quaker workers has just gone, with a first cargo of supplies, to Samara, in the famine zone, and will shortly return to America to report. The Quakers have thus far been hampered by lack of personnel. They have only six workers in Russia today, but with these work a staff of friendly Russians—including a former London Russian anarchist, two mechanics formerly employed in the Ford shops in Detroit, a Greek chauffeur, and several Russians who have never been out of Russia, some of them Communist and some of them non-Communist. Three or four old United States army cars, which were turned over to the Quakers in France after the armistice, served the period of relief work there, then moved to Vienna for a twelvemonth, now distribute the Quaker supplies in Moscow, and two of them, upon the insistence of their chauffeur, carry small Red Russian flags waving gaily over their hoods—as if to neutralize the army numbers still faintly visible upon the weather-worn covers.

Distribution is accomplished through the schools. Hitherto the Quaker work has been almost entirely confined to babies and school-children. The field of need is so vast and the funds in proportion so slight that concentration of effort was required. In May, for instance, more than 70,000 Moscow school-children received a pound of soap apiece. I passed a day carrying soap to the schools. Each school presents its list of pupils; the total is checked, the soap delivered, a receipt taken, and later the children sign individual receipts. There may be some slight loss occasionally; but the obvious test of fraud is the public markets, and thus far not a single cake of any Quaker-distributed brand of soap, nor any tin of their milk, has been discovered in any of the Moscow markets; and every report of such discoveries has been rapidly investigated.

Month by month this Quaker work has been expanding. May, the last month for which totals were available, showed these totals distributed: Lard, 16.5 tons (4 Russian pounds per child in the children's homes); vegetable oil, 8.4 tons, similarly distributed; soap, 32.3 tons; cocoa, 3.2 tons (to 1,100 children in the "forest schools" for tuberculous or near-tuberculous children); oatmeal, 2 tons; rice, 3.75 tons; about a ton of dried vegetables, chocolate, Mellen's food, and beans together; 57,000 tins of milk to 10,000 babies under a year old, and 10,675 yards of cloth.

Stories of pilfering in Russia are legion. The fact is that the actual loss from stealing in Russia has been less than the loss suffered by the Quakers from stealing in Germany, absolutely or relatively. You can put the stories of loss of Quaker relief supplies down on the same page with the nationalization of women, the various falls of Petrograd, Lenin's quarrels with Trotzky, and the other endlessly parroted lies. Not a single case of goods has been lost; occasionally a few tins have been stolen out of a case. To anyone familiar with relief work even in Western Europe that record is a marvel. Three times freight cars have gone astray, and the suspicion of theft has arisen. Each time the carload has been traced and recovered. There is stealing in Russia—as in other countries; it has not yet affected the Quaker supplies. Circumstantial stories have come to the Quakers of misuse of their supplies, as in the case where their chocolate was reported to be on sale at a particular market—before they had begun importing chocolate!

Nor have government officials interfered with or obstructed the work. On the contrary, they have given it unusual facilities, supplied gasoline and oil for the cars, obtained a warehouse, granted office space, etc. They are suspicious of new workers and examine them carefully before they admit them to Russia. But the most recent cables indicate that the famine has brought about more readiness to admit unknown workers—if they come with supplies in their wake. Sometimes the Quakers have thought the red tape, evil heritage of the old regime and of the old Russian official dishonesty, a plagued nuisance. Supplies leaving the Moscow warehouse, for instance, have had to pass seven inspections—railroad, customs, military, Cheka, cooperative, workers' and peasants', and Quaker.

The Quakers have steadfastly refused to undertake special relief for specified individuals. They take that stand to economize effort and to give a maximum efficacy to the service of their workers, but the position harmonizes with communist theory and popular prejudice. When everybody is hungry and transportation facilities are scant, people resent the shipping of private parcels to those who happen to be favored with relatives in America. The Petrograd railway men who handled carloads of American supplies sent to Russian Jews demanded the right to take toll on the parcels, and plans to grant special relief to Jews have always resulted in more hostility to the race than in real aid to the favored individuals. Hence, in large part, the difficulties experienced by Jewish relief organizations. The Cheka sequestrated some of the early carloads of private parcels on the ground that the practice involved favored a particular class and particular individuals and was therefore anti-communist and counter-revolutionary—a long jump in logic but natural in a time of general shortage. The Cheka has now been deprived of such power, and the packages were being distributed when I left, but the prejudice against individual parcels persists. The Quakers, by a simple measure of administrative economy, avoided that entire morass of principle and prejudice.

What the Quakers have done is, of course, very little compared to the possibilities and needs in Russia. The famine on the Volga cries out for relief on an infinitely larger scale. But the Quakers, by proving the baselessness of the official and semi-official excuses for callous indifference to misery in Russia, have opened the way for large-scale relief. They have proved to England and America that cooperation with the Soviet Government in relief work is possible; and they have proved to Russia that not all Englishmen and Americans shut their hearts to suffering because the sufferers tolerate a form of government hated in the West.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Law and Necessity in Bisbee

By GEORGE SOULE

ONE member of the mob which "deported" several hundred copper miners on strike in Bisbee, Arizona, on July 12, 1917, has been tried in an Arizona court and acquitted by the jury, on the ground that he acted in accordance with the "law of necessity." No others have been tried, the prosecution of all the other defendants being dismissed on motion of the prosecuting attorney. Action was brought in the Federal courts, which decided that the acts complained of were not crimes under the Federal laws. There the matter stands. For the guidance of those who may in the future become involved in similar affairs in Arizona it is important now to review the entire matter, so that men may know in what circumstances they are lawfully permitted to commit what would otherwise be a crime, and so that industrial conflict may be quickly ended by bands of citizens which, with the approval of Arizona courts, may hereafter take the law into their own hands.

The strikers, who were not rioting or engaging in violence of any sort, so far as I am able to ascertain, but are charged with threatening to do so, were seized in a surprise attack and forcibly deported to Columbus, New Mexico, by a *posse* led by Sheriff Harry C. Wheeler, of Cochise County, and composed largely of employees of the copper companies, including some of the local managers. News of the affair did not at once get to the outside world because an official of one of the companies by force of arms seized the Western Union telegraph office and held up an Associated Press dispatch. Full accounts were later published in articles contributed to the New York *Evening Post* by Robert W. Bruère, who made a thorough investigation in Bisbee soon after the event. The President's Mediation Commission, charged with the duty of ending labor troubles in these mines and other centers of the West so that war production might go on, also conducted a full investigation in Bisbee, where it had access to all the official records and examined all important witnesses. Our account of the deportation and what preceded it is based upon the articles by Mr. Bruère and the report of the President's Commission. No more authoritative sources exist.

The general conclusion of the President's Commission was expressed in the following sentences:

> Repressive dealing with manifestations of labor unrest is the source of much bitterness, turns radical labor leaders into martyrs and thus increases their following, and, worst of all, in the minds of the workers tends to implicate the Government as a partisan in an economic conflict. The problem is a difficult and delicate one. There is no doubt, however, that the Bisbee and Jerome deportations, the Everett incident, the Little hanging, and similar acts of violence against workers have had a very harmful effect upon labor both in the United States and in some of the Allied countries. . . . Too often there is a glaring inconsistency between our democratic purposes in this war abroad and the autocratic conduct of some of those guiding industry at home. This inconsistency is emphasized by episodes such as the Bisbee deportations.

Our news of the trial is from a booklet containing the preliminary statement of the case by the counsel for the defense, the argument on the law of necessity by another member of this counsel, the opinion on the law of necessity by Judge Samuel J. Pattee, the charge to the jury by the judge, the verdict, and reported interviews with the jurors thereafter. This book is published by "Bureau of Information"—no address. Inquiry to the printer, "Star Job Print —Tucson," has failed to elicit any answer as to the nature and responsibility of the Bureau of Information. The book contains none of the arguments of the prosecuting attorney, and none of the evidence. Since we believe it is being circulated by the copper interests, however, we have reason to think that our quotations from these records will prove to be accurate.

Judge Patten ruled that the deportation would be, under ordinary circumstances, a clear violation of the law of the State which forbids kidnapping, and that no member of the *posse* could be excused on the ground that he was acting under the orders of the Sheriff, since the Sheriff himself had no right to violate the law. Martial law had not been declared, and, consequently, furnished no reason for disregarding civil law. The defendant could not plead the necessity of self-defense, since the strikers had not attacked anybody. But the action might be excused on the ground of the "law of necessity." The judge's opinion on this point is well summarized thus by the foreman of the jury:

> The essence of the law of necessity, as explained and laid down to the jury by Judge Pattee, is that it protects a man in his invasion of the rights of others when his fear for his own safety or welfare is great enough to force him to a drastic step, and this fear does not have to be a fear of really existent dangers but only of apparent danger when the appearance of that danger is so compelling as to be real to him who views it.

Among the precedents cited was the case of persons who destroyed houses in Manhattan Island in order to keep a fire from spreading, and the case of Rhode Island militiamen who in the early years of the last century pursued rebels under arms into Massachusetts and forcibly brought them back into Rhode Island for trial. None was closer than this to the Bisbee case.

In order to assess the real or apparent danger which created the "necessity" we must examine the history of the industrial struggle. The miners of Arizona had for years been attempting to organize and establish collective relations with their employers—absentee owners of the immensely valuable copper properties and for the most part large and powerful corporations. A strike for this purpose was defeated in 1907. The strikers were denounced as un-American and alien agitators. They immediately adopted the un-American method of trying to remedy their grievances through the ballot, thus helping to bring about the adoption of a progressive constitution when Arizona was admitted to statehood, and electing to the governorship a man pledged to a program of advanced labor legislation, most of which was carried into effect. The companies then began to employ large numbers of Mexican and other foreign workers. The miners, fearing loss of their political power through this process, secured the passage of a law specifying that at least 80 per cent of the employees of any establishment where five or more men were employed must be American citizens. This law, fought to the highest courts by the copper companies, was declared unconstitu-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tional by the United States Supreme Court. In 1915 another strike won minor concessions. In the next election Governor Hunt, labor's candidate, was defeated with the help of the corporation interests, and a campaign of wholesale discharges began against men prominent in union activities. Yet the demand for copper had increased rapidly, profits and the cost of living were soaring out of all proportion to wages, and European immigration had been cut off by the war. The International Union of Mine, Mill and Smelter Workers, a union which practices collective bargaining and is regularly affiliated with the A. F. of L., decided that another economic struggle was necessary to protect its existence in the Arizona mines and to improve the condition of the workers. About that time the United States entered the war.

Immediately after the declaration of war, Governor Campbell appointed a labor committee under the State Council of Defense, consisting of seven representatives of organized labor and seven mine managers, with Dean William Scarlett, of the Episcopal Cathedral in Phoenix, as representative of the public. This committee called the miners and the employers to a conference in order to avoid the threatened trouble, for the sake of the more effective prosecution of the war. The unions consented, but the employers refused to enter such a conference, on the ground that they were in control of the situation and could prevent strikes, that strikes would be treasonable in any case, and that they would have the assistance of the Government in suppressing them should any occur.

Soon the miners at Jerome presented demands to their employers, with the result that their committee was discharged. H. S. McCluskey, the regular union organizer, called a meeting of the men, but on the night of the meeting five armed and masked thugs took him from his hotel, carried him thirty miles out of town in an automobile, and dropped him. Nevertheless, he returned, in the face of threats, and led the strike. Meanwhile, emissaries of the I. W. W., a more radical labor organization which does not believe in collective bargaining and is so hostile to the American Federation of Labor unions that it will adopt extraordinary measures to prevent their success, came to town and attempted to get control of the situation. According to the Jerome *Sun*, the local organ of the company actually championed the I. W. W. in its effort to secure leadership of the men, presumably in order to divide the ranks of the strikers. The miners held firm, however, until a Federal mediator forced a settlement. The I. W. W. leaders, then trying to reopen the strike by criticizing the terms of the settlement, were driven out of the district at the point of the gun by the very employers' sympathizers who at first assisted them. This event increased the prestige of the I. W. W. with the rank and file of the miners.

The I. W. W. thrives where the tactics of the employers are so autocratic as to breed intense resentment and distrust among the men. Although it failed to gain control of the strike at Jerome, it did gain the ascendancy in the later trouble at Bisbee. These miners had in general the same grievances as those who had joined the A. F. of L. organization, and the same industrial and political situation was the background of both strikes. Workmen do not read volumes of propaganda and make fine distinctions between economic theories; when they are dissatisfied they will strike, and the leaders they accept are the ones who under the circumstances are able to arouse their confidence and loyalty. The strikers at Bisbee were of the same clay as the strikers at Jerome; the leaders happened to belong to the I. W. W.

In Arizona the employers themselves made no distinctions between the unions. All strikers were called "wobblies," aliens, and traitors, and to all of them the managers were equally hostile. There is in these towns no neutral or semi-neutral public to hold the balance in an industrial dispute. Virtually all the inhabitants are employees of the companies or business men who live on their patronage. These are divided sharply into two classes—the manual workers and the managers, with their staffs and sympathizers. The strike at Bisbee was the usual sort of strike. There was no violence of any importance. There were no riots. The Sheriff telegraphed the Governor requesting United States troops "to prevent bloodshed and the closing of this great copper industry now so valuable to the United States Government." He made the usual statement that "majority strikers seem foreign. The whole thing appears pro-German and anti-American." Troops were not sent. Afterwards, Sheriff Wheeler told Mr. Bruère that his chief fear was that hostile Mexicans would start an uprising—presumably the very Mexicans who had been brought in by the employers because their labor was cheaper and they had no votes.

Bisbee at the time had a "Kangaroo court." Its presiding justice, Mr. Miles Merrill, told Mr. Bruère that he was the author of the deportation plan, and that he had perfected it after consultation with the legal adviser of the Copper Queen Mine and an executive officer of the Phelps-Dodge Corporation. Sheriff Wheeler, an old Indian fighter, put it into execution by adopting a plan of surprise attack which he had learned from the Apaches. Hundreds of miners were captured, put in box cars, and shipped to the New Mexican border. When any attempted to return, for weeks afterward, they were stopped with no warrant of law. Their families were left to get along as best they might, or to starve.

The counsel for the defense at the trial asserted that he would prove that the I. W. W. was a conspiracy to overthrow the United States Government, that it aimed to bring about the defeat of the United States in the war, that in pursuit of this purpose it had called a series of strikes throughout the West, and that the strikers in Bisbee had brought in weapons and dynamite and intended to destroy the mines and attack the rest of the population. Whether he did prove any of these things we do not know, since we have not had access to the evidence. The first three statements are mere paraphrases of similar charges made in the trial of I. W. W. leaders in Chicago. All the evidence which the Department of Justice and the American Protective League, in months of investigation, were able to accumulate was submitted in substantiation of these charges in the Chicago trial, yet the appellate court ruled that the evidence was insufficient to justify the submission of these counts to the jury. Most of the evidence submitted in the Arizona trial seems to have consisted of I. W. W. literature which the Bisbee strikers had in all probability never read. It may easily be true, however, that the members of the Sheriff's *posse*, aroused by the current propaganda of the employers, *believed* that the Bisbee strikers had all these objects in mind. If the jury thought they believed it, the judge's charge justified them in sanctioning the deportation.

Suppose, some time in the future, the miners of Cochise County are able to elect a sheriff. Suppose the employers

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

declare a lockout, thus bringing real danger—the danger of starvation—to the miners and their families. Suppose the miners organize a union to combat the lockout, and the employers then either bring in *or are reported to have brought in* detectives armed with guns and ammunition, and the workers *believe* that these gunmen are about to attack them as on July 12, 1917. It is difficult to see why the verdict of this jury would not justify the miners in thinking that they would be within the law if, under the leadership of their sheriff, they should forcibly deport the detectives and the mine managers and seize and operate the mines. In fact, according to the ruling of Judge Pattee, they would seem to be even more safely within the law than the culprits in this case. For he said, "Of course, there is a higher degree of sanctity in liberty and life than in any mere property right. . . . To warrant the deprivation of liberty or life only requires a higher degree of peril than would warrant the destruction of property." Under the Arizona law as it stands, if two parties fear attacks from each other, the one who attacks first is protected by the State.

Mexican Fundamentals[1]

By E. J. DILLON

THE present divergence between the two governments [in Mexico City and Washington] appears to hinge upon a mere matter of form: whether recognition should be accorded before or after the settlement of outstanding scores. And for form, as such, English-speaking peoples, especially those who dwell on the western shores of the Atlantic, feel and exhibit scant respect. The Mexicans, on the contrary, are wont to set it almost on the same level as substance and occasionally higher still. The forms and symbols which affect national dignity, for example, are for them things just as real as national property and are valued and cherished as highly. But the average American who holds mere forms in contempt has no understanding for the Mexican's national dignity and cannot bring himself to believe that the Mexican has any. And this is a fruitful source of misunderstanding. But the roots of the matter lie much deeper.

In this case form is an integral part of the substance and the stakes played for include much more than a question of procedure or preference. The arguments that favor a written covenant [such as demanded by Secretary Hughes] are forcible. It appears quite reasonable that the southern Republic should have a commercial treaty with its great northern neighbor—not necessarily a treaty conferring special privileges on its great sister—seeing that nowadays all states are linked together with all other states by compacts of this nature and none of them feels that its interests are damaged, its dignity wounded, or even its freedom of action inconveniently hampered thereby. Why then, it is asked, should Mexico shrink from binding herself by a formal compact of that harmless nature? Is her national dignity specifically different from that of every other nation? Is her sensitiveness a morbid symptom or a hollow pretext? The answer is that it is neither. Mexico has no rooted repugnance to discuss the terms of a commercial treaty unless it be the prelude to economic interpenetration. What she declines is a process of bargaining for recognition. And her objections are derived from international usage, from a deep-rooted sentiment—overdeveloped it may be, but very real, which the average foreigner is unable to discern or unwilling to allow for—and from an intense solicitude to preserve unimpaired her attributes of sovereignty which in this case are demonstrably at stake.

These considerations, misgivings, or precautions, trivial though they may appear to the large-hearted American, carry great weight with the Mexican who realizes the forlorn condition of his country. Mexico today stands alone in the world, isolated and impoverished. She has no powerful friend on the globe and the kind of friendship which is within her reach she instinctively eschews. Her own people are not yet sufficiently united to present a compact front to outsiders so long as the dispute is diplomatic. Many of her distinguished citizens are become *frondeurs* who mistake a party for their country and add to the difficulties of their Government. Her one strong man is exerting himself untiringly to clear away the ruins left by the subversive waves of ten years' successive revolutions. But as yet he lacks an adequate staff of competent helpers. The funds needed for urgent internal reforms are not sufficient. France and Britain who would gladly succor him financially, morally, politically are either themselves without the means or else they do not venture to take independent action in the matter lest they should offend the United States on whose good will they are dependent elsewhere. The republics of Latin America fail to see that Mexico's cause is their own. Thus Mexico, exhausted economically and morally, stands alone face to face with the greatest Power on the globe. President Obregon has naught to rely upon therefore but moral force to stay or check that mighty influence which tends to impress a new course upon the current of Mexico's national life. He presumably draws from the history of Mexico's past relations with the United States warnings and forebodings which cast a deep shadow over his picture of their future friendly intercourse. Accordingly he deems it to be his duty to withstand such pressure brought to bear upon him as would jeopardize the sovereignty of the Republic. To accuse him of criminal stubbornness for this attitude is like classifying as ferocious a certain domestic animal on the ground that it defends itself desperately when attacked. It is not surprising that a Mexican in his position should regard the violent imposition of a treaty of friendship as a contradiction in terms. He feels the force of the Russian saying that "you cannot make yourself loved by coercion."

The recognition of one government by another is hardly more than an implicit admission that the administration recognized does really represent the country, is authorized to act in its name, and can be approached and dealt with as its trustee and mouthpiece. This theory accepted and acted upon by other nations is confirmed by international precedent. Treaties are negotiated only with recognized governments, and this principle is so rigorously upheld that even when one of the countries has been vanquished in battle by the other recognition invariably precedes treaty-making. The two are never simultaneous, and to endeavor to make them so is an unwarranted innovation. In all such cases the terms of the covenant are discussed on their intrinsic merits exclusively, and to enforce them as a condition of recognition is therefore an anomaly. Whether Obregon's Government is entitled to be regarded as the legal repository of valid authority in the Mexican Republic depends upon its relations to the Mexican nation not upon its liabilities, and still less upon its readiness to accept a compact regulating its future behavior. In the history of diplomacy which supplies precedents of international law there is no example of recognition being confounded with the settlement nor even the express acknowledgment of claims made by the recognizing state. Still less does it presuppose that a treaty of friendship has been concluded or agreed upon by the two. To assume the contrary is to ignore the rules that govern international relations and to forget the bearings of recent events.

President Obregon's objections to a preliminary treaty are many and convincing. One of them is that it is a slightly dis-

[1] From the chapter Recognition by Treaty in the forthcoming book, "Mexico on the Verge," by Dr. E. J. Dillon.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

guised form of purchase money paid for recognition. Insistence upon it by the United States would be evidence that the government which the Mexican people regard as the repository of the sovereign rights of the Republic cannot be trusted even for a brief span of time. And true or false, nothing could well be more humiliating. Those manifestly are also the views taken by a number of sovereign states—among them Italy, Japan, Spain, Germany, Switzerland, the Argentine—which have already given recognition to the Obregon Administration in accordance with international usage. They implicitly hold that Mexico's differences with foreign countries can best be adjusted by diplomatic methods after recognition. And it is hardly too much to assert that Britain and France would likewise have recognized President Obregon if considerations of political expediency had not impelled them to refrain from weakening Washington's influence in Mexico by countering or checking her policy there even when that policy is a flat negation of their economic interests. . . .

The insistence of the United States Government on a treaty means that recognition on the American Continent is become something wholly different from what it has been hitherto and still is in the remainder of the world today. In international law it is no more than an implicit acknowledgment by one state that another state has a government which duly represents it and exercises legal and valid authority within its frontiers. That and nothing more. . . .

Take a case in point. Great Britain and Russia are still at loggerheads on the matter of the latter's debts, the damages which her revolution caused to British capitalists, and the compensation owing to British subjects. For in bolshevist Russia the rights of private property and free trading have been continually and systematically trampled under foot. Notwithstanding this, however, and despite other more incriminating counts in the indictment, Great Britain has recognized the bolshevist regime as the de-facto Government of Russia. . . .

Now in the case of Mexico, it is urged, the arguments against Mr. Hughes's demand have incomparably more force than those which carried the day in favor of the recognition of the Russian Duumvirate. In fact there is not a single motive drawn from Mexico's debts or commitments—none of these have been, or will be, repudiated—which can reasonably be pleaded as an argument against acknowledging the present Government, seeing that it is admittedly the agency by which the sovereign rights of the Republic are duly exercised. In fact if it be not first recognized, it cannot be deemed competent to conclude any treaty or compact or to satisfy any claims whatever.

It may be objected that the United States has created a new precedent and laid down as an indispensable condition that the Government to be recognized must first prove that it has both the disposition and the power to discharge its international obligations, and unless and until it has successfully undergone these two tests it is not entitled to be recognized. With the assumptions underlying these terms Mexico can join issue and show that this innovation has not been accepted by the community of nations, forms no part of international law, is therefore binding on no Power and is tantamount to a disregard for the law of nations.

What it amounts to is the one-sided promulgation of a principle new to international custom and tradition which shall be applicable on the American Continent to Latin American states and shall fit in with that new and comprehensive interpretation of the Monroe Doctrine which has been advocated by Mr. Fall in his public utterances. This tendency is a survival of the ambitious experiment tried at the time of the historic Panama Congress[2] and thwarted in the clash between the Adams Administration and the Jackson opposition. The object of that polity was to organize the Western Continent "as a unit in independence of, and possible hostility to, the Eastern Continent." Some of the soundest American thinkers on both sides of the Rio Grande pulverized the notion of this dual organization of the world. "In their quarrels with European states," writes the eminent American sociologist already quoted, "it suits the South American states very well that the United States should act the cat's-paw for them, *but it cannot be that their statesmen will be so shortsighted as to accept a protection which would turn into domination without a moment's warning*. . . . The advocates of the Monroe Doctrine have been forced to meet the argument that their doctrine was not in international law by new spinnings of political metaphysics. *They have to try to cover the fact that the Monroe Doctrine is an attempt by the United States to define the rights of other nations.* The modern conception, however, is that the states of the world are all united in a family of nations whose rights and duties toward each other are embodied in a code of international law."[3] That is a fair statement of the case.

Those words uttered by a sagacious and patriotic American are reechoed today by those Mexican statesmen who are endeavoring to rough-hew the destinies of their nation. They believe that they are breasting a current which—if they fail to stem it—will soon carry away the substance of Mexico's sovereignty. They are convinced that the first steps at the parting of the ways are decisive. And they are rightly resolved, come what will, to stand their ground and make the true issues clear to the whole world.

That, in brief, is President Obregon's attitude—as it appears to an onlooker—toward the imposition of friendship by a treaty and a threat. . . .

With the praiseworthy intention of helping Mexico out of her difficulties Mr. Hughes, who seems to operate with excellent abstract principles *in vacuo*, has provided a lever for all those Mexicans and Americans who are working openly or covertly for the overthrow of the present Mexican Government. In his zeal for the defense of the rights of property he is sapping the power of the only defenders of property in the Republic. In the name of righteousness he is unwittingly aiding and abetting the conspirators who are plotting to replunge the country in confusion and urging President Obregon to break his plighted word. On behalf of a great democracy he is forcing Mexico by means of a financial and political boycott to acquiesce in a treaty which it considers detrimental to its sovereignty. In these ways he has established a strong claim to be judged not by what he is doing but by what he would do. . . .

However just, then, the basic demands voiced by the State Department may be, the ground on which General Obregon declines to consider them is that they are to be embodied in a covenant and imposed as a condition of recognition. And his contention is unanswerable. For they have no more to do with recognition than a clause of the postal convention. It is pretty certain that Mexico's next ambassador to Washington will wear a decent suit of clothes there and will not clash with the criminal law of the country. But if it pleased President Harding to refuse to receive any Mexican ambassador unless his Government first promised in writing that he would don the conventional garb of civilized men and conduct himself properly, these terms would be summarily rejected and all the world would applaud. If the world is less awake to the extraordinary nature of the demand for a treaty, before recognition, it is because the issue is obscured by being mixed up with extraneous matter. The public is told, for instance, that the Mexican Constitution contains a clause confiscating the property of Americans who have invested their capital, devoted their brains, and employed their time in exploiting the oil fields and that the confiscatory effect of that clause must be neutralized by treaty before the Republic can be admitted into communion with three Powers—one may call them the Triple Entente for the Protection of American Rights. And the public accepts the allegation without further inquiry while those publicists who seek to place the matter in a different light find it difficult to ventilate their views in the United States press.

[2] In the year 1824.

[3] Cf. "War and Other Essays," by W. G. Sumner, p. 278. The italics are mine.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now that way of stating and confusing the question is hardly fair. Article 27 is not confiscatory, because it does not stand alone. If it stood alone, retroactive force might perhaps be read into it by jurisconsults, and retroactive force would undoubtedly render it what is termed confiscatory. But nothing less than that. For the clause only nationalizes the products of the subsoil and nobody has ever denied to the Mexican Republic the right to do this. What foreigners clamor against is the nationalization of property which they had legally acquired before the Constitution was passed. And their resentment would be natural were their apprehensions well founded. But they are not. All such property is expressly exempted by Article 14 which declares that nationalization shall not work backwards but only forwards. Its operation will be confined to the future and eliminated from the past. There is therefore no need whatever, Mexicans hold, for a treaty binding their Government to that interpretation of Article 27 which Secretary Hughes considers just. The Constitution itself leaves no doubt about the right interpretation. . . .

"But that is not enough," exclaim the advocates of the new doctrine. "General Obregon's successor can repudiate the satisfactory interpretation which he may now read into the Constitution and four years hence we may be exactly where we were in 1919, whereas if we possess a binding treaty signed and sealed we are on the safe side once and for all."

Now that mode of ratiocination is but a piece of specious casuistry. For if Obregon's successor can put a false construction on the clauses of the Constitution he can likewise put a false construction on the terms of the treaty. And what remedy will the United States Government have then? Exactly the same remedy which it possesses today without any treaty. That and nothing more. For even today, if the President instead of declaring, as he has done, that Article 27 will be regulated by law in a broad spirit of equity and will be applied without confiscatory effect or retroactive force,[4] had refused to do anything whatever in the matter, what line of action would then be open to the United States Government? Precisely the same that it would have under the treaty, and none other. In each case it would feel constrained to move in order to assert its rights, and shyness to come forward under such circumstances is not among its marked traits. And in both cases these rights derive from international law. Now if there is no tangible advantage to be gained by imposing a treaty as a prerequisite to recognition, what intangible advantage forms the motive for this singular demand? Mexicans answer the question by an appeal to their history and to the many evil-boding symptoms reported to them from the United States. Grounded distrust has large eyes and a quick imagination, especially when portentous facts provide the spectrum.

All that is so clear that it would be superfluous to dwell upon it were it not that the attention of the public is deflected from the main issue by a cloud of wholly irrelevant considerations which are rooted in American group, party, or personal interests and ambitions. There is but one fair way of presenting the matter to the world and it is this. Is it congruous with international law to constrain a sovereign state to conclude a treaty against its will? Is not such an act an abuse of power? Would a treaty be conducive to the praiseworthy aim which Mr. Hughes assuredly has in view, i.e., the protection of American rights? Nowise. For when he refuses to accept the guaranty now offered by the Mexican Government, it is admittedly because that Government may be unable to make good its less solemn promises. Yet it is exactly that same set of guarantors who will underwrite the treaty. There are none other.

What the American State Department, doubtless with the best intentions, asks is that General Obregon shall consent to a transaction which would brand himself and his Administration as disingenuous or weak-willed, self-seeking men who have inherited together with the liabilities of their predecessors their defects and vices. As the State Department was unable to trust Carranza's pledged word it argues that it can have just as little faith in Obregon's emphatic assurances and it implicitly calls upon him constructively to admit that it is right, by signing a document which would be superfluous on any other supposition and is humiliating and illegal on this. To contend that a treaty brought about under such conditions is not a humiliation of the entire Mexican people is to ignore the meaning of national dignity. Mexicans go further and assert that it is an attempt to goad the President into trampling on the laws of his country which he has sworn to observe and enforce. That this would be the direct effect of compliance with the demand of the State Department is evident. It is a noteworthy phenomenon, we are further told, that an instigation of this demoralizing character should have found a place in the program of a Republic to which is ascribed the future role of ethical guardian of the backward Latin-American peoples. If you want to shape a people's conduct for the general good, you must appeal to it through creditable motives and key it up to commendable, not to blameworthy, acts. A president who should openly qualify for his certificate as a good moral ruler by lawless acts and downright perjury would be a poor reformer for the ill-starred Mexican Republic.

The fundamental law which the President has sworn to observe contains an article[5] expressly withholding from him the right to conclude any such treaty as that proposed. If, therefore, he sets his hand to the covenant on which the State Department insists, he is violating both the Constitution and his oath to observe it. There are doubtless ambitious men devoid of scruples who would pay even that price for power, the names of some of them have recently become public property, but President Obregon has never been a member of the group. The inevitable effect of compliance with the State Department's demand would be to lower him to their level, and he and his fellow-citizens naturally resent the attempt.

Further, assent to the proposal would be an implicit avowal that the Constitution establishes and legalizes systematic confiscation of American property and that President Obregon considers it a praiseworthy act to violate a document of such iniquitous character. Can he be expected to make that avowal? Would any self-respecting man make it? One knows what to think of a leader who first publicly proclaims his resolve to respect the Constitution, then swears fidelity to it, and a few months later agrees to trample it under foot in order to induce a foreign Power to recognize him as its guardian. Is it conceivable that the assertion of American rights calls for such a tremendous change in the political fabric of the southern Republic as the dissolution of democratic government there and the setting up of a dictatorship, to qualify for which perjury is a peremptory prerequisite?

Many of Obregon's countrymen are prone to suspect that behind the imposition of a treaty as a preliminary to recognition lies some unavowed and sinister purpose. And this purpose they believe themselves able to perceive or divine and entitled to counter. For, as we saw, this condition in question is a recent innovation for which no satisfactory grounds have been assigned. It is known to have been unthought of before the closing months of the Wilson Administration. And it is admitted that nothing has since occurred to render it desirable or feasible—that in fact the main events which have taken place in Mexico since then were calculated to produce the opposite effect. And the knowledge of these considerations was expected to exert a decisive and restraining influence over the attitude of the Republican Administration. How telling a disadvantage it is thus to have international usage, ethics, logic, and common sense, and the example of all disinterested nations, arrayed on the side of a little state in its passive resistance to the Government of a great and fair-minded people may be gathered from recent history.

[4] Statement issued by General Obregon to the press on April 3, 1921.

[5] Article 15.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Contemporary American Novelists

By CARL VAN DOREN

VIII. ROBERT HERRICK

IF the novels of Robert Herrick were nothing else they would still be indispensable documents upon that moment in American life, at the passage to the twentieth century, when a troubled minority set out to scrutinize the exuberant complacence which was becoming a more and more ominous element in the national character. Imperialism, running a cheerful career in the Caribbean and in the Pacific, had set the mode for average opinion; the world to Americans looked immense and the United States the most immense potentiality in it. Small wonder then that the prevailing literature gave itself generally to large proclamations about the future or to spacious recollections of the past in which the note was hope unmodified. Small wonder either—be it said to the credit of literature—that the same period caused and saw the beginning of the most insistent protest which has come from native pens since the abolition of slavery. Much of that protest naturally expressed itself in fiction, of many orders of intelligence and competence and intention. Various voices have been louder or shriller or sweeter or in some cases more thoroughgoing than Mr. Herrick's; but his is the voice which, in fiction, has best represented the scholar's conscience disturbed by the spectacle of a tumultuous generation of which most of the members are too much undisturbed.

In particular, Mr. Herrick has concerned himself with the status of women in the republic which has prided itself upon nothing more than upon its attitude toward their sex. He knows, without anywhere putting it precisely into words, that the elaborate language of compliment used by Americans toward women, though deriving perhaps from a time when they were less numerous on the frontier than men and were therefore specially prized and praised, has become for the most part a hollow language. The pioneer woman earned all the respect she got by the equal share she bore in the tasks of her laborious world. Her successor in the comfortable society which the frontier founded by its travail neither works nor breeds as those first women did. But the energy thus happily released, instead of being directed into other useful channels, has been encouraged to spend itself upon the complex arts of the parasite. Ascribe it to the vanity of men who chose to regard women as luxurious chattels and the visible symptoms of success; ascribe it to a wasteful habit practiced by a nation never compelled to make the best use of its resources; ascribe it to the craft of a sex quick to seize its advantage after centuries of disadvantage—ascribe it to whatever one will, the fact remains that the United States has evolved a widely admired type of woman who lacks the glad animal spontaneity of the little girl, the ardent abandon of the mistress, the strong loyalty of the wife, the deep, calm, fierce instincts of the mother; and who even lacks—although here a change has taken place since Mr. Herrick began to chronicle her—the confident impulse to follow her own path as an individual, irrespective of her peculiar function. It must be remembered, of course, that Mr. Herrick has had in mind not the vast majority of women, who in the United States as everywhere else on earth still fully participate in life, but the American Woman, that traditional figure compounded of timid ice and dainty insolence and habitually tricked out with a wealth which holds the world so far away that it cannot see how empty she really is. He has sought in his novels, by dissecting the pretty simulacrum, to show that it has little blood and less soul.

At times he writes with a biting animus. In "One Woman's Life" Milly schemes herself out of the plain surroundings into which she was born, lapses from her designs enough to marry a poor man for love but subsequently wrecks his career and wears him out by her ambitious ignorance, and before she ends the story in the arms of another husband has contrived to waste the savings of a friend of her own sex who tries to help her. In "The Healer" the doctor's wife continually drags him back from the passionate exercise of his true gift, luring him with her beauty to live in the world which nearly destroys him, though he finally comprehends the danger and escapes her. And in "Together," its epic canvas crowded with all kinds and conditions of lovers and married couples, Mr. Herrick never spares the type. Other novelists may be content to show her glittering in her maiden plumage; he carries her story further, to the point where it becomes clear that the qualities ordinarily exalted in her are nothing but signs of an arrested spiritual and moral development. Hard and wilful enough, she never becomes mature, and she tangles the web of life with the heedless hands of a child. A less reflective novelist might be content with blaming or satirizing her for her blind instinct to marry her richest suitor; for forcing him, once married, to support her and her children at a pitch of luxury which demands that he give up his personal aspirations in art or science or altruism; for struggling so ruthlessly to plant her daughters in prosperous soil which will nourish the "sacred seed" of the race abundantly. Mr. Herrick, however, does not disapprove such instincts for their own sake. He sees in them an element furnishing mankind with one of its valuable sources of stability. What he assails is a national conception which endows women with these instincts in mean, trivial, unenlightened forms.

His criticism of the American Woman, indeed, is but an emphatic point in his larger criticism of human life, and he has singled her out essentially, it seems, because of the shallowness of her lovely pretenses. It is the shallowness, not the sex, which arouses him. In "The Common Lot," in "The Memoirs of an American Citizen," in "Clark's Field," and in certain of the strands of "Together," it is the women who demand that, no matter what happens, they shall be allowed to live their lives upon the high plane of integrity from which the casual world is always trying to pull men and women down. Integrity in love, integrity in personal conduct, integrity in business and public affairs—this Mr. Herrick holds to with a profound, at times a bleak, consistency which has both worried and limited his readers. Integrity in love leads Margaret Pole in "Together," for instance, from her foolish husband to her lover during one lyric episode and thereafter holds them apart in the consciousness of a love completed and not to be touched with perishable flesh. In novel after novel the characters come to grief from the American habit of extravagance, which,

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as Mr. Herrick represents it, seems a serious offense against integrity—springing from a failure to control vagrant desires and tying the spirit to the need of superfluous things until it ceases to be itself. And with never wearied iteration he comes back to the problem of how the individual can maintain his integrity in the face of the temptation to get easy wealth and cut a false figure in the world.

Possibly it was a youth spent in New England that made Mr. Herrick as sensitive as he has been to the atmosphere of affairs in Chicago, where fortunes have come in like a flood during his residence there, and where the popular imagination has been primarily enlisted in the game of seeing where the next wave will break and of catching its golden spoil. Mr. Herrick has not confined himself to Chicago for his scene; indeed, he is one of the least local of American novelists, ranging as he does, with all the appearances of ease, from New England to California, from farm to factory, from city to suburb, and along the routes which Americans take in Europe. But Chicago is the true center of his universe, and he is the principal historian in fiction of that roaring village so rapidly turned town. He has not, however, been blown with the prevailing winds. The vision that has fired most of his fellow citizens has looked to him like a tantalizing but insubstantial mirage. Something in his disposition has kept him cool while others were being made drunk with opportunity. Is it the scholar in him, or the New Englander, or the moralist which has compelled him to count the moral cost of material expansion? In the first of his novels to win much of a hearing, "The Common Lot," he studies the career of an architect who becomes involved in the frauds of dishonest builders and sacrifices his professional integrity for the sake of quick, dangerous profits. "The Memoirs of an American Citizen," a precious document now too much neglected, follows a country youth of good initial impulses through his rise and progress among the packers and on to the Senate of the United States. This is one of the oldest themes in literature, one of the themes most certain to succeed with any public: Dick Whittington, the Industrious Apprentice, over again. Mr. Herrick, however, cannot merely repeat the old drama or point the old moral. His hero wriggles upward by devious ways and sharp practices, crushing competitors, diverting justice, and gradually paying for his fortune with his integrity. In the most modern idiom Mr. Herrick asks again and again the ancient question whether the whole world is worth as much as a man's soul.

That mystical rigor which permits but one answer to the question suggests to Mr. Herrick two avenues of cure from the evils accompanying the disease he broods upon. One is a return to simple living under conditions which quiet the restless nerves, allay the greedy appetites, and restore the central will. The Master in "The Master of the Inn," Renault in "Together," Holden in "The Healer"—all of them utter and live a gospel of health which obviously corresponds to Mr. Herrick's belief. When the world grows too loud one may withdraw from it; there are still uncrowded spaces where existence marches simply. Remembering them, Mr. Herrick's imagination, held commonly on so tight a fist, slips its hood off and takes wing. And yet he knows that the north woods into which a few favored men and women may withdraw are not cure enough for the multitude. They must practice, or some one must practice for their benefit, honorable refusals in the midst of life. The architect's wife in "The Common Lot," Harrington's sister in "The Memoirs of an American Citizen," the clear-eyed Johnstons in "Together"—they have or attain the knowledge—which seems a paradox—that selfishness can fatally entangle the individual in the perplexities of existence and that the best chance for disentanglement may come from intelligent unselfishness. "Clark's Field" amply illustrates this paradox. The field has for many years lain idle in the midst of a growing town because of a flaw in the title, and when eventually the title is quieted and the land is sold, it pours wealth upon heads not educated to use it with wisdom. Here is unearned increment made flesh and converted into drama: the field that might have been home and garden and playground becomes a machine, a monster, which gradually visits evil upon all concerned. Then Adelle and her proletarian cousin, aware that the field through the corruption of a well-meant law has grown malevolent, resolve to break the spell by surrendering their selfish interests and accepting the position of unselfish trustees to the estate until—if that time ever comes—some better means may be devised for making the earth serve the purposes of those who live upon it.

The solution does not entirely satisfy, of course. At best it is a makeshift if considered in its larger bearings. It comes nearer, however, to solving the problems as individuals of Adelle and her cousin, who save more in character than they lose in pocket. And it might possibly have come nearer still were it not for the handicap under which Mr. Herrick, for all his intelligence and conscience, has labored as an artist. That handicap is a certain stiffness on the plastic side of his imagination. His conceptions come to him, if criticism can be any judge, with a large touch of the abstract about them; his rationalizing intelligence is always present at their birth. Nor do his narratives, once under way, flow with the sure, effortless movement which is natural to born story-tellers. His imagination, not quite continuous enough, occasionally fails to fuse and shape disparate materials. It is likely to fall short when he essays fancy or mystery, as in "A Life for a Life"; or when he has a whimsy for amusing melodrama, as in "His Great Adventure." The flexibility which reveals itself in humor or in the lighter irony is not one of his principal endowments. Restrained and direct as he always is so far as language goes, he cannot always keep his action absolutely in hand: this or that person or incident now and then breaks out of the pattern; the skeleton of a formula now and then becomes too prominent. It is his intelligence which makes his satire sharp and significant; it is his conscience which lends passion to his representation and lifts him often to a true if sober eloquence. But in at least two of his novels imagination takes him, as only imagination can take a novelist, beyond the reach of either intelligence or conscience. "Together," a little cumbersome, a little sprawling, nevertheless glows with an intensity which gives off heat as well as light. It is more than an exhaustive document upon modern marriage; it is interpretation as well. "Clark's Field," a sparer, clearer story, is even more than interpretation; it is a work of art springing from a spirit which has taken fire and has transmuted almost all its abstract conceptions into genuine flesh and blood. That "Clark's Field" is Mr. Herrick's latest novel heightens the expectation with which one hears that after a silence of seven years he now plans to return to fiction.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Bigotry Turns to Murder

By CHARLES P. SWEENEY

IN Birmingham, Alabama, American hotbed of anti-Catholic fanaticism, the murder of a priest has been added to the achievements of bigotry. Rev. Father James E. Coyle, the venerable pastor of St. Paul's Roman Catholic Church in that city and one of the most beloved Catholic clergymen in the entire South, was shot to death on the porch of his home on the evening of August 11 by E. R. Stephenson, a former minister in the Methodist Church and an inveterate participant in the movements aimed at the persecution of Catholics.

"My father didn't like Father Coyle. He hated him because Father Coyle was a Catholic." Such is the introductory paragraph to an interview with Stephenson's daughter as published in the Birmingham *News* of August 14. The young woman had fallen in love with a Catholic young man and herself became a Catholic. Father Coyle was murdered because it was he who officiated at the ceremony uniting the two in marriage. At least, such is the reason for the murder assigned by the murderer himself, as a group of the foremost lawyers of Alabama assemble to defend him and, brazen though it may seem to the folks of the North, East, and West, to obtain his release on bail pending his indictment and trial. The Birmingham newspapers calmly announce this in their columns and even suggest a refusal on the part of the grand jury to indict Stephenson.

In an article by this writer in *The Nation* of November 24, 1920, the situation in Birmingham was reviewed in detail, because it is in Birmingham that the seeds of hatred sown by Thomas E. Watson, now Senator from Georgia, and his benighted associates have yielded their greatest harvest. Here is a city of more than 200,000 people, of whom but 10,000 are Catholics, which is dominated by a secret organization of immense membership having for its one and only point and purpose the elimination of Roman Catholics from the community and, if possible, from the country. Anti-Catholicism, no longer a mere incident in a world of incidents, is in Birmingham a predominant state of mind, collectively, and a business and profession, individually. It is the criterion of political success and the arbiter of social standing. The sign is up. No Catholics are wanted in Birmingham and those now there are desired to leave. To be a Catholic is in the popular local fancy to be a soldier of a secret army sworn, at the Pope's command, to burn the nation, slaughter the Protestant men, outrage the Protestant women, and flog the Protestant children into being obedient little Catholics. To be a Catholic is to be sworn in blood to vote at the dictation of Rome for any man or any measure Rome sees fit to approve in the Pope's effort to seize the United States Government and make of it a Roman colony ruled by priests; destroy free education; legalize white slavery in behalf of the priesthood; abolish democratic institutions, foster the marriage of whites and Negroes, and put an end to American liberties once and for all. To be a friend of Catholics is to be a silent partner in the hellish plot. This is no exaggerated statement of the things that hundreds of thousands in Birmingham and in other Southern cities and towns firmly believe to be true. Tom Watson has preached and written them for years and they must be true, just as it must be true, because Watson says it, that the venerable Bishop Keily of Savannah maintains a slave pen where some twenty of the 65,000 girls reported missing last year will be found in durance vile. The other 64,980 are held captives by other bishops and priests throughout the country. This all seems drivel, but Watson, through his paper, now published from the U. S. Senate office building, which the paper gives as its editorial address, has gone to the Senate by convincing people it is absolutely true.

In Birmingham, every elective official is in office by grace of the approval of the True Americans, the secret society that runs the town and that sends vigilance committees threatening employers with a boycott unless they dismiss their Catholic workers.

Stephenson, who was removed as a minister in the Methodist Church, South, because he gained the name "Marrying Parson" by spending his days at the courthouse to earn a living performing marriages hot off the license bureau griddle, was a member of the Ku Klux Klan and other so-called "fraternal organizations" that propagate Watson's creed of hate. According to his daughter "my father had a robe of one of the organizations at home and on Hallowe'en night I wore it." He also habitually toted a gun. She tells a harrowing story of his treatment of her following her baptism into the Catholic church, a ceremony performed not by Father Coyle, but by another priest in another church.

Father Coyle was the particular target of the anti-Catholic organizations because his was the largest Catholic church in Alabama and because of his long period of service in Birmingham. He had seen a Catholic church and school at Pratt City, a few miles from Birmingham, burned down by midnight riders in 1916, and was himself threatened with death on numerous occasions. Federal authorities in 1917 learned of a plot to burn his own church and home and induced him to place an armed watchman on the property at night.

The newspapers of Birmingham may well be accused along with Senator Watson for the surge of ignorance and hatred that forms the background for Father Coyle's murder. Watson and lesser agitators kindled the fires and constantly replenished the fuel. The newspapers of Birmingham adroitly side-stepped in crises and played into the hands of the bigot organizations in periods of dulness. Their editorial influence has never been exerted against the bigot leaders and their doctrines, and by this silence the newspapers have lent strength to them. In their news columns the papers have given full play to the mad utterances of the bigots.

No more striking commentary on the psychology of Birmingham could be desired than a long letter appearing in the Birmingham *Age-Herald* of August 16, appealing for consideration of the murder on its merits as a crime against the law of the land. Where else in America but in the gallant Southland would it be necessary that such an appeal would have to be made when a good man was murdered on his front porch?

Let the country watch Birmingham during the progress

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the case against Stephenson, not for the details of a wretched murder, but for the appearance of forces that will seek to put the murderer on a pedestal of patriotic heroism and perhaps send him to Congress to help Watson legislate and educate.

Birmingham is the metropolis of Alabama and Alabama is one of these forty-eight United States. It is all very well for us of the North or West to dismiss its manifestations with a shrug or a shudder. Bigotry is as much a product of a considerable section of the South as is cotton. Both are therefore essentially American products and as such the concern of every decent American. Yet few Americans would in the usual course of events gather from the single brief news dispatch which reported the crime to the country at large that behind what was apparently the isolated act of a madman were marshaled the sinister forces of a great militant movement.

In the Driftway

THE Drifter wondered, some weeks since, why fruit that tasted so luscious in the garden required sugar on the table. Now a Colorado correspondent writes him that he lacks logic. True enough, O lady of the mountains. You are right that the fruit he plucks when he drifts into the garden is at a perfection of maturity which Mr. Haaga's, the corner grocer's, berries somehow miss before they rot. His fruit picked half ripe and shipped to market does indeed require the sugar-bowl. But when you ask the Drifter if he has ever picked the honey-sweet oranges in Florida that had fallen from an overload of sugar, you only drive him to worse illogic—to an impulse to fly to Florida in August! He has indeed roamed New England's rocky fields in midsummer and put his hand beneath the big juicy blackberries, shaking the bush ever so lightly lest the luscious morsels melt between his fingers. He has even walked the lake country of western New York when the peaches were ripe, and eaten more peaches in a day than he could afford to buy of Mr. Haaga in a month—and lived to tell the tale. There was no logic in the number of those peaches. You say you had come to look upon the Drifter as "perfectly logical"? Rather than be perfectly logical the Drifter would fill his mouth with green persimmons.

* * * * *

LIFE must be hectic in those wild Western parts known as Oregon. The Drifter who in hot weather seldom ventures into more dangerous climes than Fifth Avenue and Forty-second Street finds the following correspondence in the *Oregon Labor Press* of Portland, Oregon:

Editor of the *Labor Press:*

Under issue of July 21 you publish a scathing condemnation of the Ku Klux Klan wherein you call its members murderers, cowards, etc. Are you aware that the best American manhood in your labor organizations compose a part of the Ku Klux Klan, that to be so honored they had to convince thousands like them that they were true 100 per cent Americans in every sense, owing allegiance to no sect, foreign nation, people, ruler, or person; that they are physically, mentally, and morally above reproach, and that they are of the Caucasian race without a taint of mixed blood, . . . ? If you are the mouthpiece of American labor in this locality, and do not indorse the above principles and this organization which does, then you would be a fit subject for a Vigilance Committee (that brought law and order to many of our Western cities in early days) to vent its wrath upon. . . .

L. J. PAUEL,
King Kleagle of the Realm of Oregon

Dear King: Being of a rather nervous and excitable temperament, we were quite overcome after reading Your Highness's communication and hardly felt equal to the task of replying. You know, King, nerve-sustaining stations are scarce here, as you have probably discovered. But, King, you must have brought along a goodly supply of nerve sustainer from Georgia, because for pure unadulterated gall, nerve, crust, you have us all backed off the boards. Now, King, to answer your questions. We would not be surprised to learn that there are some union men in your organization. The percentage of nuts among laboring men is not quite so high as among business men, but there is not a great deal of difference. . . . Lastly, dear King, though it grieves us sorely to peeve Your Highness, we do not indorse your organization and have nothing to retract. Our office is located on the fourth floor of the Stock Exchange Building, on the northeast corner of Third and Yamhall. The entrance is through the main office, Room 405. We are usually in the office during the regular business hours and will assure any of your subjects a warm personal reception. Tell the gang not to bother the girl in the front office. She is nervous and excitable. Just walk right in to my private office. And don't muss up the office any more than is necessary. Somebody else will probably take charge of it when I'm gone and there's no use causing a lot of unnecessary work cleaning up.

Yours fearfully, *Oregon Labor Press*,
C. M. RYNERSON,
Managing Editor and Grand Chief High Muck-a-Muck

If Oregonese can talk to each other like that in August, the Drifter wonders what they would have to say on a brisk stinging cold January morning.

* * * * *

FRIENDS of the Drifter bid him be jealous of their summer days in old Quebec. The Drifter knows Quebec. It is nobly built on a bluff, and the sound of French on the streets is music in his ears, but there is not a block, scarcely a good row, of historic houses left. There is more historic architecture in New York's Greenwich Village, or in the old commercial district east of Broadway and below Brooklyn Bridge, than in all the city of Quebec. There is more in Boston, and at least as much in Gloucester, Provincetown, and a dozen other New England towns. Baedeker says that Quebec is "perhaps the most picturesque city in North America," but Baedeker, being a German, has ceased to be gospel. As to Sainte Anne de Beaupré, the Drifter once set out for it in the mood of a pilgrim bound for a shrine; he presently discovered that he was an excursionist to a picnic ground. He found the church of Sainte Anne to be a modern structure, set in a conventional, well-groomed garden, and flanked by a souvenir stall and an ice-cream booth. No pilgrims, no poetry, no other-worldliness! He took the next train back—not even stopping to view the relic of Sainte Anne's wrist.

* * * * *

SOME say that since the Volstead Act Quebec is the summer capital of North America as Havana is the winter rendezvous. The Drifter cannot believe it; there is not enough room. On the Drifter's last visit he took the precaution to reserve a room in advance, choosing a small hotel in the lower city; he thought from the name that it would be French and from the environment that it would be interesting. Upon arrival he was dismayed by the squalor of his room, but he thought to stick it out for a day at least. But as an old traveler he examined the bed before retiring.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Having done so, he rushed out into the night. Another hotel condescended to let him have a room for that night only, and the next day he found lodging in a private house. The proprietress said he might pay for it by the day; two mornings later she informed him that he must get out, as the room had been reserved from that date. There is a further drawback to Quebec as a refuge from the Volstead Act: the city has liquor restrictions of its own. It may seem strange that a city nine-tenths of whose inhabitants are of French descent should place restrictions on the use of beer and even of wine; but the French Canadian has little of France left in him. He has even abandoned French cooking, and when a Frenchman abandons that he ceases to be French. No, the Drifter refuses to be jealous of his friends in Quebec.

THE DRIFTER

Correspondence

The Anglo-Japanese Alliance—An Australasian View

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It may be of interest to you to know that the opposition to the Anglo-Japanese Alliance in Australasia is not wholly dumb. An article of mine is to appear in the next issue of *Stead's Review*. I think the only reason why the proposal to renew the Alliance has not been more generally condemned is because folk realize the delicacy of the situation and fear that opposition will be misunderstood as hostility to Japan.

The news may not have reached you that the Labor Party in the Federal Parliament stood against committing Australia to an alliance until the people should have had an opportunity to learn the terms and to express their wish. Although the leader of the party, Frank Tudor, had previously expressed qualified approval of the Prime Minister's intention to support the Alliance under certain conditions, he voted with the rest of the party in favor of the amendment moved by T. J. Ryan, formerly Labor Premier of Queensland, stipulating that the people should be consulted. The amendment was defeated on a party vote.

The question of possible American objections to the Alliance has been constantly before the minds of public men. The Prime Minister, W. M. Hughes, was careful to face both ways. In one passage he said that the Alliance must be renewed in spite of the fact that it was "anathema" to the Americans, explaining that he hoped it would be possible to meet the American objections; later he said it was quite unthinkable that Australia should ever fight against the United States and that England herself "would never agree to any alliance which would involve the chance" of such a war. But he ignored such inconvenient problems as those of "benevolent neutrality," and ignored also the fact that to renew the Alliance in present circumstances would amount to more than benevolent support of Japan's Far Eastern policy—a policy that is in some respects offensive to Americans. Mr. Hughes's most definite statement was this:

> The only thing I ask this Parliament for authority to do, without further reference to Parliament, is to renew the Anglo-Japanese Treaty in some form acceptable to Great Britain, to Japan, to Australia, and, *if possible*, to America; provided that no renewal shall impair the principle of a white Australia.

Outside of Parliament labor opinion has been more definitely expressed than in the House against the renewal of a compact like the present Alliance. E. G. Theodore, Premier of Queensland, wrote vigorously against the Alliance in the English *Review of Reviews* for June, 1920. W. G. Mahony, labor member of the Federal Parliament, said in Sydney a few days ago that it seemed imperative from the Australian point of view that some understanding or arrangement should be made with America regarding the "white Australia" policy. America was outside the League of Nations. The nations in the League did not understand the "white Australia" policy and could not be expected to be in sympathy. The Hobart *World* (labor daily) fiercely attacks Mr. Hughes's policy and denies the truth of his statement that Australia wants the Alliance renewed. It says that Australia wants world disarmament and that, if it cannot get that, it wants an understanding with the United States rather than with Japan.

However, it is a fact, as you have doubtless been informed by press cables, that most of the editors of city papers follow the Prime Minister docilely, accepting his assertion that our safety demands the renewal of the Alliance. This appeal to fear is the only argument I have seen. It amounts to this: "We are afraid of Japan; we should therefore bind her to us in an alliance, and so diminish our danger and save the cost of a huge navy."

No one who moves among the Australian people can believe that this sordid attitude represents their true sentiment. I say "sentiment" rather than "opinion" because I believe hardly any earnest thought has been devoted to the subject. Of sentiment there is still an overabundance of the arrogant hostility to Asiatics that is so blatantly expressed in California. Peaceable folk are grateful that the provocative outcry of prewar days has been subdued. Before the war two of the most notable anti-Japanese agitators were W. M. Hughes, now Prime Minister, and the Sydney *Bulletin*. Hughes was so outspoken that when the Anglo-Japanese Alliance was renewed in 1911 he said he welcomed it—as giving Australia ten more years to strengthen her defenses! The Japanese know, of course, what value to place upon the present humility and friendly approaches of such a man. As to the *Bulletin*, it is very remarkable that that paper has made no comment on the recent parliamentary debate, apart from a cartoon implying a lighthearted sneer at "the little child" Hughes attempting to lead America, Britain, and Japan along the path of peace.

I fear it must be confessed that Hughes and the *Bulletin* in their old-time impudence represented the mob-psychology of Australia fairly well; now they represent nothing but their own sordid diplomacy. Still, there has been always a body of opinion that would favor a fair understanding with Japan, free alike from arrogance and from licking of the feared one's hand. The desire for an *understanding* has become more conscious, I think; it was strongly expressed at an Australasian conference of peace and labor organizations held in Melbourne during Easter. But there is a great difference between an understanding and a military alliance. I am convinced that not one Australian in a hundred, if he gave the matter a moment's thought, would favor binding this country by an *alliance* to support Japan in certain circumstances in war with an unnamed enemy.

In Parliament and in the press the position of China has been little noticed, for the simple reason that very few Australians realize the importance of the matter. Hints have been dropped that Japan should be allowed to have her own way in the Far East. Australians would certainly not be keen to fight Japan in order to win for British and American capitalists the financial spoils of the Far East, for which there is growing competition. If their feelings were worked upon, they would probably respond to the call of chivalry on behalf of China, though many have come to suspect "chivalry" as the financiers' decoy to young heroes. In any case, few Australians have given the matter any deep thought. But their sentiments, I believe, are strongly opposed to an alliance which involves them in support, even moral support, of Japan's activities in China and Siberia. There is, of course, a still stronger instinctive resentment against any suggestion of introducing Asiatics into the wars of the white peoples. Even during the war with Germany the effort to subdue that instinct was only partly successful.

Melbourne, Australia, May 2 J. A. BRAILSFORD

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"For Officers Only"

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Permit me to add a few words to the splendid series of articles by Arthur Warner, headed The Truth About the American Legion. A careful analysis of the membership of the American Legion shows in some cities a gang of nobodies, men who were nothing before the war and who now that they have worn stripes or bars want to be somebody. Army life has demonstrated the lack of fundamental education of the average American and the slave mind of the free and independent citizens. Lack of initiative often became evident when there was nothing to eat and it took the "Reds" to provide and feed the hungry. The spirit of mob violence so apparent after the demobilization of our army could therefore not be the product of the ex-soldiers themselves. Let us place the responsibility where it belongs, to wit, on the Wilson Administration.

On our way home from Germany and France every soldier received "literature" issued by the Department of Labor, in which we were warned against the radical agitators who were undermining the Government of the United States and in which Russia was cited as a warning example. Pending our discharge in various camps we were forced to attend lectures by specially drilled officers who vilified radicals and urged upon every red-blooded American the duty to treat radical soap boxers as rough as possible. These lectures became a daily sport with my company during the dreary days and as soon as they were finished I was always forced to give a talk on socialism, because I had the honor of having been court-martialed at the instigation of the French Government for being a Socialist, and the United States collected two-thirds pay for three months, or $66.60, for my opinion. I recommend the stenographic report of special court martial No. 5 of the Thirty-third Division to your International Relations Section as a worthy document of the twentieth century inquisition. Needless to say that my own freedom of speech was not curtailed, and we often remarked that while I was at liberty to say anything I pleased in the army my dear comrades were compelled by their patriotic duty "to knock my block off" when I should appear on a soap box in civilian clothing. The great mass of American soldiers never entered the trenches and did not get acquainted with real war, and as good automatons they are shooting off the guns loaded by the plutocrats of our patriotic war administration.

The American Legion is an artificial organization, and if it does not change it will not appeal to the ex-soldier as a mass organization except in small towns where the post is the village dance committee. The bonus propaganda was taken up by the leaders, who were all opposed to it, only as bait for new membership. The men who did the actual fighting are not attracted by this officers' club, and evidently read the signs of our democratic army in all places worth while in Europe, "For officers only."

Chicago, August 21 HERMAN F. JESSEN

A White Blackbird

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: It may be of interest to you and your readers to know that Forges Post of the American Legion, Chicago, composed almost entirely of men who saw front-line service and the commander of which has been an active member of organized labor for many years, at its last regular meeting protested against the action of the South Park commissioners in prohibiting the Washington Park open forum from meeting in Washington Park and that it also indorsed Senator Borah's bill for defense of the rights of free speech and free assemblage.

Chicago, August 11 THOMAS K. DAVEY

German Diplomats

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: On June 5, 1921, the New York *Times* published a letter commenting favorably on the appointment of Dr. Rosen as new German Foreign Minister. In a footnote the editor says however: "Unfortunately it must be added that Dr. Rosen's diverse talents were put to a somewhat unhappy use in 1905 and 1906, when he was the Kaiser's chief instrument in Morocco. The type of diplomacy there exhibited is hardly the sort of thing that will make friends for the German Republic."

This comment of the New York paper is unfortunately but too justified, and the same or similar objections might be made to the accomplished or impending appointment of various men in the foreign service of Germany. For the German Foreign Office continues to be controlled by the type of men who have controlled it in the past. Practically all branches of the foreign service of Germany are monopolized by the nobility, the junkers, and the privileged classes owing to the lack of trained diplomats with democratic tendencies.

There is serious danger that the "junkerism" and Pan-Germanism prevailing with the staff of the Foreign Office with but few exceptions will seriously interfere with the reestablishment of friendly relations with other countries, particularly with the former enemies of Germany. A democracy should be represented in other countries not merely by men with good manners at table or with high collars and a high conception of personal honor and a readiness to fight duels to defend it, but rather by representatives of the people, the masses. It would be both common sense and good psychology if Germany should insist on having men of her academic, industrial, professional, and working classes represent her in other countries instead of the old type of militarists and monarchists. What is particularly needed for the restoration of trade and friendship with other countries is men with an international outlook, with an intimate personal knowledge of other countries, of their ideals and of their psychology, men from the crowds, not men from "above the crowds." JOHN MEZ

Freiburg i. B., Germany, July 14

Lloyd George's Proposals to Ireland

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: When you come to comment upon Lloyd George's proposals to Ireland I trust you will not overlook Conditions 4 and 5. Though you dislike tariffs, I presume you will admit Ireland's right to have one if she wants it.

In the current number of *The Nation* it is shown that under the agreement by which Denmark acknowledges the sovereignty of Iceland "Danish and Icelandic goods and products must mutually receive no less favorable consideration than those of other countries." I hope you will make a point of this. It shows that Denmark has dealt with Iceland much more liberally than Lloyd George proposes to deal with Ireland. That it is a misnomer to call the government offered to Ireland "Dominion Home Rule" Condition 5 of Lloyd George's proposals plainly shows.

Brooklyn, New York, August 17 A. L. DALTON

No Triple Alliance

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In accounts published in American newspapers of the proceedings at the British Imperial Conference, now sitting in London, I find the following statement: "The British Prime Minister and Foreign Minister and the Prime Ministers of the British overseas dominions think the time is ripe for approaching the United States with a proposal to substitute '*some larger*

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

arrangement' between the United States, Great Britain, and Japan for the Anglo-Japanese *alliance."* In reading the above one is irresistibly reminded of Admiral Sims's recent speech at a London banquet in which he said that England and America combined could control the earth (or words to that effect). It is quite within the bounds of diplomatic usage and possibility that the gallant admiral was (unconsciously, of course) prompted in his speech by "friendly conversations" which he had held with British diplomatists—in short, that a straw was thus thrown up in London to see which way the wind was blowing in America. We should reply, in courteous and diplomatic language, that America has no desire to control the earth, but on the contrary very earnestly desires to attend to her own internal affairs; that she has forty-eight States, each one as large as a European country, and is therefore quite satisfied with her present position.

A settlement of all questions in dispute, leading to a mutual reduction of armaments, would be cordially welcomed, but a "larger arrangement" for the control of the earth could not even be considered by America.

Portsmouth, N. H., August 10 BERTRAND SHADWELL

Judge Webster Thayer's Fairness

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In the August 3 issue an editorial writer in a brief notice of the conviction of Sacco and Vanzetti for murder in the first degree commends Judge Webster Thayer for "his fair and just charge to the jury." How could any one thus characterize Judge Thayer's charge when he deliberately appealed to all the patriotic prejudices of the jury, when he admonished them "to be loyal to the Government," "to seek courage in your deliberations such as was typified by the American soldier boy as he fought and gave up his life on the battlefields of France"? In truth the whole trial was conducted as a persecution of the defendants for unpopular ideas. The fact that both men produced many reputable citizens to prove their alibi and had always led honest lives was of no avail. Everything was done to create the illusion in the minds of the jurors that they were in the presence of dangerous men: policemen surrounded them to safeguard their lives; the defendants were daily paraded shackled through the streets; spectators were searched for weapons at the courthouse doors, until the jury became convinced that the State considered these men dangerous and that they were doing a patriotic duty like unto that performed by the boys in the trenches in rendering a verdict of guilty even although there was every proof that they were guiltless of the crime for which they were on trial. Will you not correct the false impression of fairness in Judge Thayer's charge?

Jamestown, R. I., August 8 NATHALIE B. ELLS.

No Catholic Crisis

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: In your issue of August 10 appears a letter from Morrison I. Swift, captioned The Disintegration of the Pulpit, which, due to a common inaccuracy, might give rise to a misconception in the minds of some of your readers. Mr. Swift writes of "the theological crisis," the "students' strike against the church," "the theological training of students is out of date," "this desertion of the pulpit," etc. If he refers solely to the Protestant churches and pulpits I have no objection to make, but if by "the church" he includes the Catholic church, and theological seminaries of the Catholic faith, I beg to differ with him. In order "to keep the record straight" I wish merely to say that there is no crisis, no shortage, no desertion, no disintegration in Catholic theological training centers. Nearly a dozen Catholic dioceses in America are either building, or making plans for the erection of, new and more commodious theological seminaries to teach a greatly increasing number of students.

Brooklyn, August 11 PATRICK F. SCANLAN

John Burroughs

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Will you kindly print this request in the literary column of your paper?

Roxbury, New York, July 25 CLARA BARRUS

Dr. Clara Barrus, literary executor and authoritative biographer of the late John Burroughs, asks that all persons owning interesting letters from Mr. Burroughs will communicate with her at Woodchuck Lodge, Roxbury, N. Y. All letters sent will be promptly copied, or extracted from, and returned to the owners.

England is greeting
NORMAN ANGELL'S new book

THE FRUITS OF VICTORY

A SEQUEL TO "THE GREAT ILLUSION"

as the latest word of "a prophet whose prophesies have come true" (London Daily News). His famous sensational prophecy as to the effects of a great modern war ("The Great Illusion," 1911) have been justified.

Now He Prophesies

as to how war will be ended. It is not capitalism, not greed, not hate, which perpetuate war, he says, but IDEALISM. Can we change ideals? he asks, and describes how he believes we can.

One of the few superlatively important books

Price $3.00

THE CENTURY CO.

353 Fourth Avenue New York City

A Great Biography

QUEEN VICTORIA

by

LYTTON STRACHEY

$4.49

R. H. Macy & Co. Inc.

Herald Square New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Books

The Ends of Man

The New Stone Age in Northern Europe. By John M. Tyler. Charles Scribner's Sons.

Human Behavior in Relation to the Study of Educational, Social, and Ethical Problems. By Stewart Paton. Charles Scribner's Sons.

The Direction of Human Evolution. By Edwin Grant Conklin. Charles Scribner's Sons.

TOWARD the end of a readable and enjoyable outline of the main facts of neolithic culture in Europe Mr. Tyler strikes an anxious note. "The *élite* of wealth, learning, and culture today," he complains, "have generally given up the search for ends in life. The old question: 'What is man's chief end?' sounds archaic. We are doubtful as to the existence or desirability of such a thing. We are, in the language of the broker, very 'long' on means, but terribly 'short' on ends, for which there is no market. Some day we shall again find a place for end and purpose in our philosophy and science, as in the systems of Paul, Plato, and especially of Aristotle, with his 'passion for the obvious,' but at present these thinkers are back numbers. Yet we must have ends of life beyond mere survival, comfort, or luxury, and getting a living. Some scale of values, not solely and purely mercantile, would also be useful." This note may be nuanced by each and every one of us to suit the requirements of his temperament, but it cannot be laughed away. We are all uneasy, all wondering a little about the whither of life. The insouciance of less self-conscious ages, when men could afford to forget the ends of life because they were so trustfully accepted, seems to have gone. Freed from the shackles of positive faiths and superstitions, we now find ourselves clogged by a more mischievous slavery than we ever knew, a bondage to unpatterned and undirected activity masking an inner emptiness. Our very keenness of sight has burnt away the significance of what we look upon. Hence it comes that so much of our writing and lecturing is preoccupied, the ventriloquistic utterance of absent souls.

These three books are no exception to the rule of divided attention. Men sincerely engrossed in the enfoldment of neolithic European culture should not be too anxious to save out of neolithic mentality a reassuring spiritual fundament, attributable to the "common man," which is to help us forward over difficult ways. The text is too remote from the urgency, even though the sermon does not ring wholly false. Again, only one that loves his prejudices more than his science can so depart from the sober task of laying bare the essentials of "human behavior" as to take his cue from chapter headings like Imperfect Organization and Man and the Progress of Civilization for self-relieving diatribes—anti-bolshevist, anti-German, anti-pacifist, anti-futurist. A neurologist, no less than his patient, has the right to be nervous and irascible, but we doubt if his psychology has that right. Mr. Paton clearly believes that there are weightier presences in the air than sensori-motor arcs. But the scientist, the artist, and the lover have the momentary privilege of setting the object of their contemplation above the salvation of humanity. We do not readily forgive them a bungled expression because they have been swerved from their idolatry by things that matter. Mr. Conklin's distraughtness is not so apparent, swathed as it is in the gentle language of Chautauqua. But it is there, insidiously, pervasively. We instinctively distrust an evolution that incidentally saves for us our "democratic" ideal and even takes the teeth out of "religion." We would rather it were not quite so accommodating, but went cryptically on its way, disdainful of local comforts. Mr. Conklin comes to us with a message. "The inspiring visions," he whispers, "of prophets and seers concerning a new heaven, a new earth, and a new humanity find confirmation and not destruction in human evolution viewed in retrospect and in prospect, for the past and present tendencies of evolution justify the highest hopes for the future and inspire faith in the final culmination of this great law in

> 'one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves.'"

It is lucky for us indeed that Darwin's old dragon turns out to be Santa Claus incog.

In spite of all the wishful thinking, now sentimental or chivalrous, now stridently eugenic, in spite of all the telescopic, I-dare-you-say-no glances into the future, these books, taken together, are useful for a philosophy of ends. They afford a certain basis of fact around which thoughts may crystallize.

The fully developed neolithic, or "polished stone," culture of Scandinavia and of Central and Western Europe antedates the dynastic period in Egypt and is ultimately founded on an Asiatic culture which reaches back to 10,000 B.C., if we may trust Mr. Tyler's interpretations of recent archaeological researches at Anau (in western Turkestan) and at Susa. This culture reached probably its most typical development in the Lake Dwellings of Switzerland, but it had many local varieties, exemplified by the megalithic monuments of Western Europe and by the different areas of distribution of types of ornamented pottery. Its basic and most persistent elements were not so much the many beautiful varieties of smoothly finished artifacts of stone or the impressive dolmens, with their religious connotations, as the domestication of several useful animals and the cultivation of cereals. Both of these features are still at the root of our modern economy. The importance of the domestication of cattle far transcended the immediate demand for beef, milk, and leather. The late neolithic use of the ox for wheel-traction and plowing was a necessary step in the eventual development of modern machinery. Neolithic culture forms the basis of European civilization in a more than merely chronological sense, for most of the dominating ideas or cultural determinants in our life of today were then present in germinal or developed form. Add to this the fact that the basic racial types of modern Europe are clearly represented in the skeletal remains that have come down to us from neolithic times, and we get a notion of our substantial fixity over long periods in the midst of overwhelming changes in the apparent run of history. For a philosophy of ends Mr. Tyler's book gives us this thought, that if our free quest of ends is to concern itself with the basic "substance" of our lives, with the conscious manipulation or even creation of specific fundamentals, whether of race or culture, we are likely to be smiled at for our pains. Mendelian inheritance and the historical process have their own ideas about the superman.

The historical process, the cumulative drift of culture that formally transcends the reactions of the individual organism, is not envisaged by Mr. Paton. Like most psychologists and neurologists, he is more familiar with the chemistry of life than with its architecture. Glandular secretions, so it would seem, are more likely to prove the efficient causes of human behavior than the imponderables of tradition. But for this obtuseness to the historical sky-line of human conduct Mr. Paton is hardly to be blamed, for each discipline creates its own myopia. In his more special province, the nature of human behavior from an organismal standpoint, he has much of value to give us. It is a pity that his book is written in a needlessly heavy style and that the argument moves in so sluggish a current. Mr. Paton recognizes the extreme complexity of the organic determinants of human behavior, also the very provisional character of many of our currently held dogmas as to the nature of this behavior. Probably the greatest service he renders is his insistence on the functional unity of an individual's behavior, physiological and psychic, at any given moment of time. An "idea" rising into consciousness is not simply the psychic correlate of neural activity localized in a certain brain "center," as is so often held; it is rather one aspect of a vast network of activities affecting the whole body at once. These activities include not only sensory stimulations and motor discharges and inhibitions too

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

complicated to follow in detail, but all manner of muscular, visceral, and glandular processes that register explicitly in consciousness only under unusual circumstances. Overstimulate a sense-organ here, or too powerfully inhibit a neural discharge there, and there can be little doubt that the intimate texture and color of the "idea" have in some degree been modified. The more popular and more easily apprehended psychology that rigidly localizes states of mind and attributes specific rather than quantitative differences to them thus relapses into a kind of "scientific phrenology," to use an apt phrase of the behaviorists. Behavior is not a sum of specific activities, each independently set in motion by a given stimulus in the environment, but the rhythmically fluctuating register of the "set" of the organism as it is responding to all the stimuli, inner and outer, to which it is capable of responding. So extremely functional a method of conceiving human thought and activity, if we choose to adopt it, must color our attitude toward the problem of ends. May it not be a vain thing to look for specific ends and may it not be a more comforting thing to value life for the rhythms and patterns of its process?

"The Direction of Human Evolution" is a discussion, not valuable but lucid, of the commonplaces of evolutionary doctrine. Mr. Conklin draws a commendably sharp line between biological heredity and the "inheritance" of social features, which are acquired characteristics. The distinction once made, however, it is practically ignored. The superficial formal parallels between the process of organic evolution and the course of "social evolution" are made the most of, and the eventual arrival of our troubled human ship into a haven of good things and nice feelings is said to be the end-point of a single magnificent impulse that began with the overworked amoeba. While Mr. Conklin makes no serious contribution to the problem of the direction of human culture, he makes it clear that the future of man is essentially a matter of culture, not of biology. No significant organismal changes are to be hoped for or feared. In spite of the expert breeders, Shavian and other, it would seem to be not in the least likely that man will make of himself a higher potential instrument than he already is. Man as an animal, as a psycho-physical machine, is a *fait accompli*. He has attained biological fixity too long ago to make it worth our while worrying overmuch about his points. Something may be done to eliminate undesirable individuals, but the serious hope of man can only rest in the cultural process itself, not in the nature of the organism that carries culture.

Mr. Tyler's querulousness as to the present lack of interest in the ends of man is intelligible enough. Still more readily intelligible is the lack of interest itself. A clear conviction of the presence and power of the ends which he longs for is possible only if we feel that there is or will be an intelligence that must be gratified by the attainment or pursuit of these ends. This intelligence may be paternal to man; in other words, we may be called upon to do God's bidding. Or it may be projected into the dim future as a dream-realizing humanity; in that case our task should take the form of parental self-sacrifice. Or, finally, the ruling intelligence may be our desire of today; we must then demand the fulfilment of ends here and now. We are in a sorry way at present about the orientation of loyalty. God seems to have died; we are thrown back on ourselves. Unfortunately, we were never less clear about the nature of the individual, of society, and of the cultural changes that are taking place all around us. Is our society but a matrix and a stimulus for individual expression, or is the individual merely a thorn in some massively flowering process that we can know but dimly? The too systematic restlessness of evolution and a too easy command of the externals of our natural environment have conspired to give us the insolence named *hubris*—see H. G. Wells for a passing example of this spirit of the *nouveau riche* which is in us all. We allow ourselves to be hurried into frenzied analyses and undertake to map the endless sea of life, not caring to make a cosmos of the transient wave we ride. From this *hubris* must proceed, first, disgust, and later, a chastened humility.

The concluding remarks of this review are framed in the spirit of the coming humility, so nearly visible indeed. If, as the more serious scientists tell us, the fundamental features of our physical and mental endowment are unalterably fixed, and if, more significantly still, the waves of the historical process conform to an unwilled necessity, are none the less iron for their seemingly infinite fluidity, we may well turn from man as an organism and from his culture as a cumulative inventory of achievement and speculate on the harmony or disharmony of a present culture or of an actual personality, leaving direction, the insistent why and whither, to undiscovered gods and winds. Such an approach to the problem of ends is aesthetic and geometric, frankly non-teleological. It goes so sadly against the prevalent American grain that we may well try it out as discipline.

We are often accused of materialism. To defend ourselves from the grosser implications of the charge we hasten to build educational institutions, compound cultural pellules, and, if we are pathologically inclined, embrace thrice material schemes of spirituality—soul nostrums of varying hue. Being most patently "material" when we aim to be spirit itself, we betray the intimate nature of the malady, which is a blind trust in the specific of life, in the mere subject matter of experience. Form, which is so insistently confused with manner, is ignored or rather unfelt; rhythm is not guessed at. The concept that we need to struggle for is the reconcilement of the individual rhythms of desire with the patterns of social life. When such a reconcilement has been effected, whether in the form of a poem or of participation in a war dance or of a beautiful set in human relations, an "end of man" has been attained more authentic than any abstract ideal yet proposed. A society offering the maximum of harmonious reconcilements is the greatest end we need concern ourselves with. Such societies or segments of society have existed and will again emerge. The problem of ends is not one of time nor of building material. It is solved every now and then within some fortunate crystal-drop of time.

EDWARD SAPIR

Not the Last Word

The Russian Bolshevik Revolution. By Edward Alsworth Ross. The Century Company.

IN calling his book "The Russian Bolshevik Revolution" Mr. Ross perhaps means to suggest that the triumph of the bolshevist group was an unescapable consequence of the first uprising against the czarist regime. Otherwise his title would be misleading, for his narrative closes with the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly and the beginning of the Lenin-Trotzky experiment. The events of the ten months comprised in this record lend themselves to treatment as a unit. They may be viewed as the turbulent overture to the vast drama whose denouement is even now but faintly perceptible. To view them so, however, is to imply an adverse judgment of the principles, or at least of the wisdom and force, of those who guided Russian policy during those months. On the part of Mr. Ross this implication is unintentional. His sympathies, so far as they are expressed, are clearly on the side of Kerensky; his single expression of positive censure is directed against the high-handed course of the Bolsheviks with the Constituent Assembly. In general, however, he carries out his promise of impartiality, so much so that to some readers he will seem to be a special pleader for the Bolsheviks. The impression results necessarily from the task forced upon the writer. He is compelled to spend time in refuting the wild, unfounded charges which were circulated against the Red leaders, both at home and abroad, and the events themselves somehow create a bias in favor of the party which triumphed by wider vision and energy. This is especially illustrated by the two chapters which describe the abortive uprising of July and the final overthrow of November. Incidentally, these are the most interesting chapters in the book, not because they throw a favorable

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

light on the conduct of the Red leaders, but because they are the only ones containing appreciably new material.

If Mr. Ross's account of the facts is accurate, then Lenin and his chief advisers were not guilty in July, 1917, of a farcically feeble attempt at a coup, but displayed a great deal of sagacity in trying to restrain some reckless groups who had got out of hand. How shrewdly Lenin calculated the situation all along is further proved by the hollow sound made by Kerensky's collapse. In telling this part of the story Mr. Ross reproduces from Russian sources reports by Podvoisky, Antonov, and Kamenev, who were the leaders directly responsible for carrying into effect in Petrograd and Moscow the plans of the Military-Revolutionary Committee. These statements, now for the first time accessible to English readers, claim a degree of moderation and humanity for the Red revolutionaries with which they have not generally been credited. We repeat that Lenin and his followers come off exceedingly well in this version of the events and Mr. Ross's peroration is left very much in the air. In the elaborate simile with which he closes the volume, the Russian peasant, preparing to blow himself out of a dungeon with the aid of dynamite and not heeding the fact that the door has been opened, sets fire to the charge and "wounded and half dead from the blast, he drags himself through the breach in the wall to freedom. But he might have stepped forth unscathed through the open door!" The possibility is not made plausible by Mr. Ross's manner of stating the facts.

Aside from its spirit of fair play and the new material referred to, the book is disappointing in that its contents for the most part do not rise above the view of the impressionistic observer. There is a feeling of thinness and sketchiness about most of the chapters. There is no wide utilization of sources or balancing of diversified evidence such as we look for in a historical work. Sometimes one set of partisan witnesses is appealed to, sometimes another. Our knowledge of the November revolution, for example, is made to rest exclusively on the accounts of the Bolshevik leaders. And the material does not receive a unified literary form. It reads, especially the first half, like a collection of unconnected papers on various phases and scenes of the revolution which the author might have written in response to the immediate provocation of the successive events, and to which he later added documents obtained from published sources. Some episodes are presented through instantaneous journalistic flashlights, some through sober, uncommented documents. The parts are not cemented or even fitted together. This weakness is the more apparent because of Mr. Ross's open-mindedness; his views seem to undergo modification from one chapter to another. However, these are strictures which we might not have felt called upon to make were it not that the publishers advance for the book a claim to become "a standard history on its subject." Its merits are considerable, but not of such an order.

JACOB ZEITLIN

Hail Columbia!

Hail Columbia! By W. L. George. Harper and Brothers.

MR. H. W. NEVINSON has recently spoken flatteringly of American courtesy. It is a virtue which recent visitations of English literary stars of the first, second, and third magnitude have abundantly tested. That one of them for the first time visiting America, staying only five months, could do as much toward understanding the American scene as Mr. George has done is, in view of the British record in such matters, unexpected. Nor can his discernment be entirely accounted for by his own explanation that he has been nearer the inside than most visiting Englishmen because he "wanted to." Perhaps his description of himself as a "conservative English radical" more nearly serves to explain it. At any rate, the relief with which one finds the familiar Washington and Lincoln replaced by the less well worn Alexander Hamilton and Robert E. Lee as representatives of Old America is a typical consequence of the freshness which pervades the whole book. Mr. George consistently refrains from drawing conclusions and stresses the fact that his observations are only impressions, friendly, and based upon what he believes to be facts. In some cases these impressions reveal the patchwork character of his observations, for at best he could live in only certain limited parts of the United States—New England, New York, Chicago, a farm in Kansas, an oil town in Oklahoma, a little town in Alabama typically southern. The impression, for instance, made upon him of the value set by the average young Harvard man upon learning for learning's sake, and the ambition of the Yale young man to be a cheerful bridge between Harvard and the Western universities —the Old World and the New—may seem to some of us more kindly than critical. However, the strangeness of Harvard and Yale as American institutions in comparison with the newer Middle Western and Far Western universities did not escape him. He recognized in all the older communities of the United States the constant warfare that goes on between the old and the new elements. In Boston he saw the whole spirit of the conflict typified in the new sign on the Common which reads not "Please Keep off the Grass" but "Keep off the Grass. If You Want to Roam, Join the Navy." In fact, Mr. George found the signs all over the country enlightening as to the New America. At railroad crossings, of course, he met the familiar "Stop, Look, Listen"; in St. Louis, trolley-car standards announced "Don't Jay Walk; Cross at Crossing"; in St. Paul, a restaurant explained its *raison d'être* by three gigantic letters "Eat"; in a Chicago factory employees and visitors alike were urged "Be like a postage stamp. Stick till you get there."

It was in the Middle West that Mr. George came upon what he considered the true America, or rather America in process of being made. In it he found America's chief work of art and her real contribution to architecture beside the skyscraper—the grain elevator; in it he found "liberal" bookshops with works on democratic and sociological questions and radical pamphlets and Russian literature, a marked contrast to the Library of Congress where there was "only one book of Anatole France, the mildest of all"; in it he found a natural wealth and abundance which made careless farmers, but often produced a vivid culture. "Wealth does not necessarily create aristocracy, but it can do so. I feel that the aristocracy of America will not be maintained out of the elegancies of Boston or the languors of South Carolina, but is being born, born of the rugged, fierce stock of the Middle West."

In a country which is often said to have no traditions Mr. George discovered a profound ethical tradition which makes America still tend "to estimate people according to their morals." As distinct from this he met occasional outcroppings of Puritanism, a trait which, in his judgment, originates largely with men and is encouraged by women for their own advantage. American women, by the way, he considered not an "entirely new human species" but essentially like other women, differing from them only in exterior manifestations of character. The American mind seemed to him made up largely of hunger and innocence with a demand for lyricism which accounts for its noisier aspects. At the beginning of his visit he wrote: "I feel an America so ruthless that she will strip me of my shirt, an America so kindly that she will give me a better shirt than I could buy. As if among the nations she were Robin Hood." This impression was confirmed by his later judgment: "But if I had to be born again, as I was born, of a family that had no influence worth anything, no money, no lineage—if I had to make my way again, as I had to, against difficulties such that at the age of twenty-five all I possessed was a hundred dollars of debts, well . . . in spite of all temptations to belong to other nations I should have felt that there was only one place for a young man who wanted to tear from life full value for his efforts; in spite of all temptations I should have been born an American."

IRITA VAN DOREN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Histoire Comique

A Mummer's Tale. By Anatole France. John Lane Company.

"HISTOIRE COMIQUE," the title this novel received when it was published several years ago in French, is better than the one it bears in English, but of course the title is untranslatable. The grotesque difference between the French words and their literal counterpart in English—such as "A Comic Story" or "An Amusing Tale"—is symbolic of the difference between the French spirit and the American which makes it difficult to convey to us the true quality of just this kind of literature.

A bare recital of the story will help to make this clear. It is a new variation of the Columbine-Pierrot-Harlequin legend. Nanteuil, a young actress with a superb body but a commonplace soul, has been the mistress of Chevalier, a minor actor for comedy parts who is himself a tragic figure. He longs for great roles and a great love, but nature has given him a face which perpetually and unconsciously grins, and his love has fallen upon a light woman. Tiring of him, she deserts him for a substantial bourgeois lover. Chevalier, after much mental torture, commits suicide on the doorstep of the house where she has been celebrating her new amour, his last words forbidding her to belong to his rival. Thereafter she cannot lay Chevalier's ghost, which invariably appears before her just as she is about to yield herself to her lover. At length she has to give up in despair.

Such a story might have been told, and probably would have been told by many another author, as a poignant tragedy. But M. France's touch is far too light and keen for that. The story, after all, is not Chevalier's story so much as it is Nanteuil's, and she is by no means a tragic figure. Her situation is really comic. Utterly naive except in the ways of the world, she cares for nothing but the fleshly, and in that she is an artist. We cannot help laughing at her on every occasion when the climax of her so smoothly prepared triumph is frustrated by the grim apparition—a spiritual fact which she does not understand. Chevalier's love bothered her not at all when he was alive and his tragedy was still genuine; but now that he is gone it returns to annoy her beyond endurance. And the annoyance is merely the creation of her own fancy. The fact that she is comic, and that Chevalier has taken her so seriously and has laid such a solemn course upon her, pulls him also into the comic circle. How energetically she intrigues to secure for him, a suicide, a Catholic funeral, so that he will not come back again to mock her, while her friends comment sentimentally upon her affection for him! How eloquently the doctor of the theater tries to dispel her delusion with long lectures on materialism! And with what small success, for this little materialist, blind to spirit in the living world, cannot forgo her superstition of spirits in the realm of death.

Every character in the company, every moment in the story, is etched dryly with a satire that is neither cruel nor kind. We smile at these people as some god might smile at a curious race of insects. Notwithstanding that its humor plays about such a grim situation, the book never lacks delicacy. The emotions of its characters are portrayed with an intimacy as faithful as the emotions of its author are remote. It is all as hard and finely cut and brilliant as a gem.

To most American or British authors such a theme would probably appear trivial. From our representative novelists we demand people whom in some sort we can take seriously, situations with some import in manners or morals. All such considerations are forgotten by Anatole France when he writes a novel like this. He has no need to appear imposing. He can describe the physical perfections of a trifling actress in her dressing-room with as sure and charming a touch as if he were writing of Cleopatra. He can tell her strange and laughable tragedy as justly as if his heroine were a Tess. Nothing adventitious contributes to his success—not even a sense that he is revealing the importance of commonplace personalities. The simplicity, the clarity, the penetration of his style is achieved with such ease that it is hardly noticeable. The result is a work of literature which conveys a rare pleasure, the kind of pleasure which surely deserves to be called æsthetic.

G. S.

Books in Brief

THE Talmudic efflorescence of speculation and commentary clustering about the figure of Shakespeare never ceases, but rarely is an item in the process so curious as "The Portrait of Mr. W. H." (Kennerley), the germ of which Oscar Wilde published in *Blackwood's* in 1889. It now seems that he afterward elaborated it into a story several times the original length which, however, has lain unknown till the present handsome edition of one thousand copies. Making the story longer, of course, could not make the theory more credible; it is still but a pleasant fancy of Wilde's that the "W. H." whom Shakespeare called the "Onlie Begetter" of his sonnets was Willie Hughes, the boy actor who played the parts of Shakespeare's heroines; for whom the dramatist felt an affection which called forth the richest language of the Renaissance ideal of friendship; from whom he was separated by an intrigue with the "dark lady" entered upon for the purpose of saving the boy from her wiles, only to see the boy eventually go to another theatrical company. Wilde brings much subtle argument to support his claim, but it has the misfortune to be supported by nothing more substantial than arguments and guesses which might be matched on behalf of almost any imaginary Elizabethan. Viewed as fiction, however, this is a charming story, adorned with dainty erudition, presented with a nice fictive art, written in a graceful, insinuating style, and rounded out with a whimsical conclusion that draws the teeth of the narrative's apparent seriousness.

"I CANNOT doubt that when the arduous efforts of the peace congress are over—an awful task, far surpassing a dozen conferences of Vienna—there will appear higher peaks behind mountain summits, there will appear the almost more gigantic task of reorganizing the British Empire." Those who desire to gain an insight into the nature of this task, referred to in these words of Lord Rosebery's, will do well to read Professor H. Duncan Hall's "The British Commonwealth of Nations" (London: Methuen). The book deals with what may be called the international relations within the British Empire, the relations, that is to say, between the Dominions and the United Kingdom. It shows how Dominion nationhood and the development of international government within the empire have both been promoted by the events of the last few years and how far the empire has traveled along the road to a regime of voluntary cooperation between equal, autonomous states. The absolute equality of the Dominions with the United Kingdom and the maintenance of the formal unity of the empire can be reconciled, the author believes, only by distinguishing between legal power and constitutional right, and the time is ripe, in his judgment, for a general and authoritative declaration of constitutional rights by a special constituent imperial conference. Such an assembly was called for by the Imperial Conference of 1917 and will probably be held next year.

IF it is true that the children of this world are wiser than the children of light, Irwin St. John Tucker must be among the very elect, for his "History of Imperialism" (The Rand School) is more distinguished by originality than by any of the other virtues coveted by the historian. It takes a virgin mind to produce such bits of history as this: "Jesus was put to death . . . for obstructing the draft . . . His Sermon on the Mount began with a startling 'Hurrah for the class-conscious poor for they shall bring about the brotherhood of men!'" Or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

as this: "The constant companionship of Ares and Aphrodite is but a personification of the fact that prostitution always goes with war. . . . Aphrodite Anadyomene, Venus Rising-from-the-Sea . . . is at the bottom no more than the Greek way of saying that wherever there are sailors there will be brothels." The author is at his best in discovering analogies between the ancient and modern. Like Jaques he sees the inner meaning of everything: mascots in the ancient gods, the Carnegie Institution in the Egyptian priesthood, Republicans in ancient oppressors, Socialists in saints, Bolsheviki in the Shepherd Kings, Vice-President Fairbanks in one of the Pharaohs and Wilson in another. On the other hand Mr. Tucker flounders beyond his depth when he ventures into the mysteries of Latin and expounds the constitution worked by a newly discovered class, the "civites Romani."

"CHRISTIAN Socialists" is a word which frequently creeps into newspaper headlines and leads to most absurd misunderstandings. There is no adequate study of the social Catholic movement in English, yet Catholic parties, often very radical in their social programs, are powerful factors in most continental countries. Parker Thomas Moon in "The Labor Problem and the Social Catholic Movement in France" (Macmillan) provides a scholarly if sometimes over-academic study of the French movement which, beginning with LePlay and Périn, developed through the Catholic Workingmen's Associations of that vivid figure, Comte Albert de Mun, into the Popular Liberal Party. It is one of those paradoxes so common in French political history that Comte de Mun, sitting on the extreme Right of the Chamber, was one of the leading apostles of social reform legislation. Mr. Moon writes as a learned and conscientious partisan of the Action Populaire Libérale; if he sometimes overemphasizes the influences of that party in working-class circles, he has nevertheless given us a dependable and documented guide where we had none. Perhaps some day Mr. Moon will enlarge his field and give us a textbook of Catholicism in politics throughout Europe. The chapter in which he skims the work of Archbishop von Ketteler and of the Westphalian Catholic labor groups and glances at the Austrian Christian Catholic Party gives us a thirst for more; the vigorous liberalism of the Flemish Catholics also deserves report. And we should like to hear more of the Catholic labor unions, at least as significant as the political parties.

Drama

First Fruits

THE theatrical business, we are told, is in a bad way. Yet out of the prevailing gloom come strange, apparently irresponsible flashes of hopefulness. The activity in the theater is, at all events, enormous. With an almost hectic speed the existing houses are being filled; six new ones are on the point of completion. One of these is promised us as a house of art; another is to be called the Music Box. The character of the rest will hover between these obvious extremes. All managers are tense with preparations; hundreds of actors are rehearsing. And it is not altogether delusion that sees everywhere a gradual improvement of tone, a shy and often unwilling and often only tacit admission that the theater is not only a business but an art.

Of this improvement in tone and attitude there are evidences in the earliest offerings of the season. Involuntary and sometimes not even ingenuous tributes are paid to styles of dramatic writing which, until but the other day, Broadway met with stony or cynical contempt. The case of Mr. Roi Cooper Megrue is interesting and to the point. Some years ago he wrote "Under Cover" and "It Pays to Advertise." These titles speak for themselves. A couple of seasons later he appeared with a play called "Tea for Three." It was not a great play;

The Negro Fresh Air Committee

131 EAST 66TH STREET

NEW YORK CITY

☼ ☼ ☼

A committee of colored and white, men and women, which has furnished outings to colored women and children for 16 summers

Asks for only $500

to enable it to keep its camp open until mid-September.

$500 Five hundred dollars will do it. $500

We still need $300 for August salaries, and $200 for food for poor mothers and babies.

The colored mothers and children who have spent the hot July in New York's tenements, have wilted and drooped just like the white mothers.

Think what a week in our camp on the shore of a lake in the Palisades Park would mean to them!

It costs $1.50 for transportation, and $5.25 for food. $6.75 a week for **every** one.

Please help us quickly, or we close!

Make checks payable to

THE NEGRO FRESH AIR COMMITTEE

and send to

131 East 66th Street

New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

it was not even a very good play. But the inner point of view was so civilized that it did not need Mr. Megrue's acknowledgments to Carl Sloboda to inform one that here was a play of the Schnitzler school. Today poor Sloboda and his play "Am Teetisch" are not mentioned. But the *Times*, in an article on the "Evolution of Megrue," declares that his "new mood was not definitely signalized until 'Tea for Three' came along." To appropriate a thing is surely to show a profound sense of its charms. "Am Teetisch" did, indeed, influence Mr. Megrue's mind even if it could not touch his art. In "Honors are Even" (Times Square Theater) he is after an astute combination. He has a rough melodramatic fable of native invention. A girl is saved from the machinations of a thievish villain by a manly hero. But this fable is tricked out with a hundred attempts at psychological acuteness and illuminating speech. All these attempts fail, of course. To write profoundly it is necessary to have thought with freedom. And even adapting a play by one of Schnitzler's imitators will not teach you to do that. Mr. Megrue cannot so much as conceal the pride of his recent and uneasy familiarity with the manners of the patriotic and sporting rich. How he loves a steel magnate! His native impulses are too much for him. Like poor Ovid he sees and approves the better way and follows the worse. But he does approve that better way and the grace of his approbation must not be denied him.

The newcomers are in better case. They have less to unlearn. Mr. Henry Wagstaff Gribble does more than add to our gaiety; he adds to the promise of our dramatic literature. He has been influenced by Oscar Wilde. Or, rather, he has, like Wilde, adapted the tradition of artificial comedy to his time and place and given it a new inner tone. That tone is softer than Congreve's and sincerer than Wilde's. Mr. Gribble makes it clear to the attentive observer that his artists are so mad because they are so sensitive and instinctively cultivate eccentricities to avoid being bruised by the harshness of the world. His laughter is neither cold nor detached, and his wit is whimsical as often as it is ironic. It is, moreover, extraordinarily copious. At the end of the first act of "March Hares" (Bijou Theater) one was willing to wager that the flow would cease. Moments of perilous thinness did occur. But always Mr. Gribble recovered himself. At the end of the performance it was clear that pure comedy, unwaveringly intelligent, high spirited and clean of any blotch of sentimentality, had at last been written on this Continent. Mr. Gribble's next step must be to guard the external proprieties, the mere proprieties of social situation, a little less timidly. The turning up of Claudia Kitts's husband was a blot. Claudia, of course, had no husband. Brown was the cook's irate sweetheart. But as it is, Mr. Gribble's satiric situations have been called ugly names. It is incomprehensible. He is most kindly and decorous. A little touch of steel and fire is all he needs.

Of "Sonya" (Forty-eighth Street Theater) one expected a little of the spiritual seriousness that commonly comes from east of the Vistula. But the Polish authoress, Mme. Zapolska, has evidently read both Anthony Hope and George Barr McCutcheon and her Baltic kingdom is bounded by Graustark and Ruritania. Even in those romantic principalities, however, things were not quite as obviously made of papier-maché as in her imaginary kingdom and no ancient general—a heavy villain of the militaristic type—was suddenly delighted by the prospect of having a little circus-dancer for his queen. It is, of course, the story of Cophetua, the story, from another point of view, of Cinderella, with variations, and that story always has its appeal to the guileless heart. It is here set forth, moreover, by Otto Kruger and Violet Hemming, two players, especially the lady, of extraordinary comeliness and some traces of mimic skill.

Two seasoned Broadway purveyors of mystery and sentiment, Guy Bolton and Max Marcin, are responsible for "The Nightcap" (Thirty-ninth Street Theater). But mystery is getting dear. With the officer of justice turning out to be the criminal, as in "The Bat," the final variation on this particular theme was reached. The authors, knowing that their technical conclusion was bound to be lame, distracted attention from it by farcical and ironic elements neither of which are quite devoid of adroitness and force. That, too, is hopeful. The brassy thunder of crook melodrama is following Hazel Kirke into the silence.

LUDWIG LEWISOHN

INDEX FOR VOLUME CXII

of *The Nation*

MAY BE HAD ON REQUEST

THRIFT

This is the proper time to start your thrift program—

Commodities Are High
Securities Are Low.

Your dollar at the present time has an approximate value of 60c. in purchasing commodities, while it has a value of about $1.50 in purchasing securities.

Take advantage of this condition by purchasing high grade investments at their present low prices and pay for them at your convenience on the

Rose 20 Payment Plan

Our interesting and practical booklet

"How You Can Become Financially Independent"

Explains how the plan operates also the many advantages it offers the small investor.

Booklet sent FREE on request

Ask for No. 702.

ROSE & COMPANY
50 Broad Street New York

Do You Know the Present Position of the Company in which You Own Stock?

If you do not, then you should secure a copy of our July Investor's Handbook, which is universally recognized as being the best, most complete and useful pocket manual of stocks and bonds published for the information of investors, containing as it does vital, up-to-date statistics covering corporations whose securities are listed on the country's various Exchanges.

Ask for NN-71—Free upon request

E. M. FULLER & CO.

Members of Consolidated Stock Exchange of N. Y.

50 BROAD STREET NEW YORK

Chicago Cleveland Pittsburgh Newark Boston

(*Direct Private Wires*)

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Two Sections

The Nation

August 31, 1921, Vol. 113, No. 2930

Section II

International Relations Section

The Economics of Reparation

By J. A. HOBSON[1]

I. REPARATION IN THE VERSAILLES TREATY

THE pre-armistice agreement under which Germany laid down her arms contained the following provision for reparation:

"The President declared that invaded territories must be restored as well as evacuated and freed. The Allied Governments feel that no doubt ought to be allowed to exist as to what this provision implies. By it they understand that compensation will be made by Germany for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allies and their property by the aggression of Germany by land, by sea, and from the air."

When the question came up for settlement in the terms of the Versailles Treaty, Mr. J. F. Dulles, addressing the Supreme Council on behalf of the American delegates, recorded their judgment that "The foregoing language constitutes, in so far as reparation is concerned, the terms upon which the United States and the Allies agree to make peace with Germany and the terms upon which Germany accepted the armistice on November 11, 1918."

To this category of reparation the American delegates added another, not expressly laid down in the Wilson declaration, but held by them to be inherently right and unaffected by those declarations, viz., that "Reparation is due for all damage directly consequent upon acts of the enemy clearly in violation of international law, as recognized at the time of the commission of the acts in question." How much would have been added to the sum of reparation by such compensation, properly assessed before an impartial international tribunal, and offset by any similar compensation for violation of international law that may have been committed by Allies, it is, of course, impossible to compute. But it may be held certain that any assessment of these two sorts of reparations (or probably of the first alone) would amount to a sum at least equal to Germany's total ability to pay, as determined by any fair consideration of her resources.

The Americans, however, held that the proposal, pressed by the British and the French delegates, for the inclusion in reparations of the entire "costs of the war," as distinct from these defined damages, was a plain violation of the pledge of the pre-armistice agreement. Those who agreed to the case for the extension, relied (in particular the French) upon the terms of the armistice agreement of November 11, 1918, which contained Clause 19, opening thus: "With the reservation that any future claims and demands of the Allies and the United States of America remain unaffected, the following financial conditions are imposed: Reparation for damage done." This general reservation, made subsequently to the pre-armistice arrangement, they contended, left the Allies free to present any claims for reparation they thought fit. The American rejoinder to the effect that the armistice terms were "a military document, designed only to insure the Allies being in a position to enforce the peace arrangements previously entered into," and in nowise competent to modify or override the earlier agreement, was for some time not accepted by the members of the Supreme Council who stood for the inclusion of "war costs." Nothing short of the instruction of President Wilson that the American delegates should dissent "and, if necessary, dissent openly" from a procedure "which is clearly inconsistent with what we deliberately led the enemy to expect and cannot now honorably alter simply because we have the power,"[2] stopped the Supreme Council from this flagrant violation of their pre-armistice pledge. But the other Council members reinstated a large section of their claim under "actual damage." For in Article 232 of the Versailles Treaty we read: "The Allied and Associated Governments, however, require and Germany undertakes that she will make compensation for all damage done to the civilian population of the Allied and Associated Powers and to their property during the period of the belligerency of each as an Allied or Associated Power against Germany by such aggression by land, by sea, and from the air, *and in general all damage as defined in Annex 1, hereto.*" Now while the body of this clause conforms to the pre-armistice agreement, its tail contains violations as patent and almost as substantial as that of the proposal to include the entire "war costs" under reparations. For on turning to Annex 1 we find the whole of "pensions and separation allowances" brought under reparations on the ground (adduced in a memorandum by General Smuts) that they came under the head of "damage to the civilian population of the Allies in their person and properties which resulted from the German aggression." Now any reasonable reading of this Smuts memorandum makes it evident that it validates the full French claim for including the entire cost of the war, and that its logic involves that the whole of the Allied war expenditure met by taxation and loans, including the interest to be paid in all war-borrowing, should form a claim for reparation.

"What had really happened," writes Mr. Baruch, "was a compromise between the Prime Minister's pledge to the British electorate to claim the entire costs of the war, and the pledge to the contrary which the Allies had given to Germany at the armistice."[3]

But this extension of the pre-armistice reparations to include pensions, allowances, and other *indirect damages* to civilians by no means exhausts the violations of the earlier agreement, contained in Annex 1. The provision that Germany shall be responsible for the reparation in respect of civilian damage done by her Allies is equally indefensible. This illicit extension of the claim on Germany was doubtless due, in part, to the fact that the other Allies could not be regarded as capable of any financial reparation, in part, to the desire of certain representatives of the Allies to load on to Germany a completely crushing burden of indemnity.

The failure to fix the total amount of reparation Germany was called upon to pay was an almost necessary implication of these violations of the pre-armistice agreement. Difficult as was the task of assessing fairly the material damage sustained by the inhabitants of the invaded areas, by partial commissions naturally sympathetic with the sufferers and therefore lenient in their scrutiny of claims, an approximately correct estimate of this damage might have given a sum admittedly within the capacity of Germany to pay. The addition of these vast new obligations of unfathomable magnitude rendered it virtually impossible to reach a figure measuring the total damages for which reparation should be claimed. Any such figure would be recognized as of purely speculative value and its magnitude might have been such as to evoke that reasonable scrutiny of Germany's "ability to pay" which it was deemed politically expedient at this stage to postpone. For, as will presently be shown, any serious attempt to check the "costs" or "damages" basis of reparation, by this consideration of capacity to pay, would have exposed the Allied statesmen to the charge of having wilfully deceived their peoples in holding out the expectation of such indemnities as would restore their national finance.

This exposure could only be averted, or postponed, by a refusal to name a fixed sum for reparation. This course was

[1] J. A. Hobson is the distinguished English liberal thinker and economist. Among the books he has published are "The War in South Africa," "The Science of Wealth," "Towards International Government," "Democracy after the War," "The Problems of a New World," and others. He is one of the contributing editors of *The Nation*. [2] Baruch, p. 25.

[3] Baruch, p. 157.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

adopted by the Supreme Council, and their Reparation Commission, which, while prescribing definite sums to be paid at intervals within the following years, postponed until May of 1921 the declaration of the aggregate sum and the conditions, in time and in kind, of its payment. The Reparation Commission provisionally arranged that, while the ultimate amount to be paid should be left unsettled, four large separate payments should be made by Germany at named dates, in the shape of gold-mark bond issues.

The first issue was of £1,000,000,000, payable on May 1, 1921, without interest.

The second was to cover Belgium's war costs, and was expected to amount to £800,000,000 due May 1, 1921.

The third series amounted to £2,000,000,000, bearing interest of 2½ per cent from 1921 to 1926, and 5 per cent thereafter, with 1% for sinking fund. This would retire the bonds by 1951.

A further series of bonds for £8,000,000,000 was to be issued on some unnamed date, provided that the Reparation Commission decided that the obligations for interest and sinking fund which it involved could be met.

Further issues of unnamed amounts might be authorized by the Commission from time to time. This course they took, though warned of the double damage it entailed (1) in sapping the incentives to industry and saving in Germany and increasing her difficulties of procuring outside raw materials and credit, (2) in enabling and inducing Allied statesmen to postpone the "day of account" with their peoples and thus encouraging extravagances of expenditure and deficiencies of taxation based upon the false pretense of huge indemnities from Germany. Financiers and economists, whose advice was sought but not followed by the Supreme Council, appeared to have been unanimous in holding that (1) the real basis for computing reparations was Germany's capacity to pay, and (2) that fixing a reasonable indemnity without delay was advantageous to "capacity to pay"! They differed, however, very widely in their estimate of "capacity to pay," varying in the figures which they gave from some 2,000 million sterling to 25,000 millions.[4]

If the strict interpretation of the pre-armistice obligation had been kept, it might have been feasible to assess the total reparations on a basis of proved damages, but the inclusion of pensions, allowances, and other immeasurably great items in Annex 1 would yield a result so far in excess of Germany's actual or potential capacity to pay as to render such a process of assessment nugatory. It might, therefore, be taken as generally admitted that the real problem is that of ascertaining the maximum amount which Germany can afford to pay and the Allies to receive from her. The importance of this latter qualification will appear a little later on. The first question is that of measuring Germany's capacity to pay. But before proceeding to discuss such measures it is important to recognize two guiding principles laid down for instruction to the Reparation Commission.

The first is that reparation should have due regard to the economic life of Germany. In the interpretative note to Germany of June 16, 1919, the Allied and Associated Powers made the following declaration:

"The resumption of German industry involves access by the German people to food supplies, and by the German manufacturers to the necessary raw materials and provision for their transport to Germany from overseas. The resumption of German industry is an interest of the Allied and Associated Powers as well as an interest of Germany. They are fully alive to the fact, and therefore declare that they will not withhold from Germany commercial facilities without which this resumption cannot take place, but that, subject to conditions and within limits, which cannot be laid down in advance, and subject also to the necessity of having due regard for the special economic situation created for Allied and Associated countries by German aggression and the war, they are prepared to afford to Germany facilities in these directions for the common good."[5]

The second guiding principle is that the performance of the reparation by Germany should be secured, if possible, "within a period of thirty years from May 1, 1921,"[6] though it remains within the discretion of the Commission to postpone for settlement in subsequent years "any balance remaining unpaid." To this latter provision Mr. Baruch, however, appends the following brief commentary: "From a practical standpoint, the present value of a sum payable without interest after thirty years is very small. To have required interest payments on sums due after thirty years would have meant the practical impossibility of ever discharging the principal of the debt."[7]

II. THE PARIS DEMANDS

This recital of the treatment of the reparation problem from the time of the pre-armistice agreement to the insertion of the reparation clauses in the Versailles Treaty has been necessary in order to bring out the four radical defects in all subsequent attempts at a settlement of the issue. The first is the violation of the pre-armistice agreement limiting the sort of damage for which reparation should be made. The second is the procedure by assessment of the extended damages without close regard to ability to pay. The third is the unjudicial and necessarily erroneous assessment of damages and of modes for payment by a partial tribunal. The fourth is the failure of the Allies to undertake to give the industrial, commercial, and financial conditions rendering payment possible. The cumulative effect of these initial errors is seen in each stage of the proceedings to enforce the reparation clauses. The basis of computation and the time conditions laid down in the treaty were such as ruled out from the start any possibility of fulfilment on the part of Germany. Any payments in kind, or Allied expenses to be defrayed by Germany, were to be determined arbitrarily by one interested party. The value of deliveries in kind, such as coal, ships, engines, was liable to be depressed by the enforcement of their delivery at a more rapid rate than the economic needs of the recipients required. This policy had the further necessary effect of injuring the productive power of Germany, and so reducing her general ability to make subsequent payments of reparation.

The failure of Germany to satisfy the first demand for the payment of £1,000,000,000 in gold values by May 1, 1921, was made inevitable by these conditions. The amount of Germany's net payment could be reduced by bloating the costs of the armies of occupation or by the low valuation of the goods delivered. The former process was inevitable when the military authorities of the occupied areas had no inducement to keep down expenses. In point of fact the payment for an American private soldier approximated to the salary of a general in the German forces, and it was notorious that most of the luxuries in these areas which figured in our press as evidence of German wealth were for the exclusive use of the Allied soldiery. But the fundamental injustice and irrationality of the claim to be a judge in one's own cause comes out in the valuation of the deliveries. Germany claimed to have delivered, after due allowances, the full sum of £1,000,000,000. The Reparation Commission assessed these deliveries at £400,000,000. A large part of this wide difference was by admission due to the fact that the Germans valued at the time of delivery, the Commission at a later period when values had fallen, chiefly owing to the very size of those deliveries of coal, ships, dyes, etc., in the face of a shrinking market. But quite apart from this consideration lay the natural tendency of the two parties to value in accordance with their respective interests. In no important private business bargain would it be deemed possible to get a fair valuation by the method laid down in the Versailles Treaty. This violation of the elementary principle of equity poisons the whole reparation question, making any pacific settlement impossible. For the treaty provision by which Germany was compelled to admit the judgment of her enemies as final in all disagreements as to fulfilment of demands is nothing other than an indefinite continuance of the rule of force in peace time. As time goes on it will become continuously more evident that there can be no security for Europe until the question of fulfilment of the reparation and all other conditions of the treaty has been removed from the arbitrament of one of the interested parties and put under the jurisdiction of a genuinely international tribunal.

The inherent injustice and unreason of the method pursued in its bearing on reparation are evinced in the refusal to take as the basis of actual demand an objective view of Germany's

[4] Baruch, p. 46. [5] Baruch, p. 58. [6] Article 233.

[7] Baruch, p. 60.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ability to pay. Seeing that by the illicit additions made to the pre-armistice bill, the war damages against Germany (however fairly assessed) must greatly exceed the early capacity of Germany, it might have seemed reasonable that the Allies should have done their utmost to explore, test, and value that capacity, and should have striven to adjust their demands to it. But no such thing. Political considerations required the Allied Governments to maintain the position that Germany was to be made to pay the war expenses, and that vast sums would be recovered from her to lighten the Allied debts and restore their finances. Politics disinclined them for any closer scrutiny of the economic sources from which these phantom billions were to be drawn. When driven into a corner they committed themselves to quite fantastic calculations, without relation either to the power of Germany to pay, the willingness of the Allies to receive such payment, or to the terms of their own treaty under which they professed to act. Of such a character were the Paris demands of January, 1921. These demands required, first, the payment of fixed annuities to the following amounts:

100 millions	£	per annum	for the first 2 years from May, 1921.
150	"	"	next 3 years.
200	"	"	" 3 years.
250	"	"	" 3 years.
300	"	"	following 31 years.

The sum of these forty-two annual payments is £11,300,000,000, or, at their discounted present value, some £5,500,000,000. But to these payments of fixed amount are added forty-two payments "equal to 12 per cent ad valorem of Germany's exports."

How much this 12 per cent on export would have added to the fixed annuities, it is of course impossible to estimate with precision. But one admitted economic truth enables us to make an approximate calculation. The total net annual payments for reparation must be represented in an excess of export over import values. For in no other way can the payment in gold marks or world currency be met. Now German export trade requires an import trade to furnish the foreign raw materials without which most of the staple exports, e.g., metal goods and textiles, could not be produced, and to supply the deficits in goods and materials needed for the support of the working population. Though no closely fixed proportion exists between this import trade and the export trade, every increase of the latter will involve an increase of the former in some proportionate scale. Mr. Keynes shows reasons for holding that it is impossible to suppose that "Germany could continuously maintain her exports at a value of more than, say, 40 per cent above her imports." Upon such a basis the payment of the earliest and lowest of the annuities, with the 12 per cent, would involve a total export trade of nearly £700,000,000 with an import trade of £500,000,000, yielding surplus imports approaching £200,000,000, a sum enough to pay a fixed £116,000,000 with the 12 per cent tax of £84,000,000. Every fresh step in the increase of fixed payments would, of course, entail a corresponding increase of the tax amount, until after eleven years the high level of an annual payment of about £400,000,000 would be reached.

Having regard to the facts that the export trade of Germany in 1920 did not reach one-half of the £700,000,000 which Mr. Keynes holds normally sufficient to support the payment of the first of the annual demands, while the trade balance for the year exhibited a surplus not of exports but of imports, the Paris demands seem to be impracticable at their start. But suppose that by a special financial effort, such as the sale or mortgage of internal capital resources, the earlier payments could be made, is it credible that in eleven years' time provision could be made for the annual payment over a period of thirty-one years of such a sum as £400,000,000? Can anybody contemplate the economic situation in which year after year so vast a tribute could pour out of Germany into the Allied countries, flooding their markets? The very thought of such a predicament was enough to evoke plans of a most determined kind for keeping out these goods by all the nations threatened with such bounties. If the bad exchange of Germany sufficed to drive a "free trade" people like ours into protective legislation, before the era of indemnities began, what would happen when the manufacturers and traders of the several Allied nations saw their own reparation policy impelling Germany to undersell their own products not only in neutral markets but in their home markets, in order to pay the instalments of the reparation?

At first the Allied politicians tried to wriggle out of the predicament by futile proposals to demand payments in exports of raw materials which Germany was to find either out of her own national resources or, as must inevitably be the case, out of other countries into which she was to be free to "dump" the cheap manufactures we could not consent to receive. But though this seemed a satisfactory way out to Mr. Lloyd George, our business men saw that nothing would be gained by keeping German manufactured goods out of our markets, if these same goods were going to oust us from all the neutral markets of the world and often to invade our markets in the disguise of finished neutral commodities.

But, finally, suppose that the Allies had been willing and able to receive these huge supplies of unpaid exports, and to adjust their economic systems to the regular gratuities, what would happen when the forty-two years came to a close, and the parasites were suddenly robbed of their accustomed prey? One has only to state the problem in order to show how incredible it is that this scheme of Paris should have received support of any economic authorities. Quite manifestly it emanated from the disordered brains of politicians not concerned with facts or their consequences, but with keeping up appearances and feeding the passions and credulity of their people.

But before proceeding to discuss the latest form of the reparation demands, it may be well to point out that the Paris demands, and the situation to which they gave rise, were as illegal in form as they were foolish in substance.

Article 233 of the treaty empowered not the Supreme Council, but the Reparation Commission, to determine the amount of the reparation, to notify it to the German Government "on or before May, 1921," and to "draw up a schedule for securing and discharging the entire obligation within a period of thirty years from May 1, 1921." The Supreme Council substituted for the Reparation Commission their own unauthorized will, infringed their own instructions to that body by adding to the fixed payments demanded an indeterminate body of taxation, extended the period of payment to forty-two years, and enforced these demands at once instead of waiting for the default of Germany. Moreover, the "sanctions" they applied are not in accordance with the provision of this part of the treaty. For the Allies had themselves laid down explicitly in the Versailles Treaty the method of procedure for determining the amount of the reparation and for arranging its payment. It provides that, in the event of Germany's failure to make payment, the Commission may postpone the payment or that "such other action may be taken as the Allied and Associated Governments, acting in accordance with the procedure laid down in this part of the present treaty, shall determine." This makes it clear that such changes in the terms of reparation, and in the methods of enforcement, lay entirely outside the competence of the Supreme Council and could only be made by the Commission or by the Allied Powers as a whole, in cooperation with the United States of America.

III. THE ULTIMATUM TERMS

Those who have complacently assumed that the reparation issue has at last been brought to a satisfactory settlement by Germany's acceptance of the latest decision of the Reparation Commission (communicated to her by the Supreme Council under the cover of an ultimatum) are the dupes of external formalities that ignore or hide the really relevant considerations. Neither the decision of the Reparation Commission nor the German acceptance takes due account of what we must recognize to be the determinant factor of the issue, Germany's capacity to pay. The decision merely reiterates Germany's liability under the treaty to pay the damages assessed to her, and lays out the methods and times for payment. Capacity to pay, so far as taken into account at all, is assumed, not proved. Nor can Germany's acceptance be taken as presumptive proof of her capacity. It is common knowledge that the signature of Germany to the latest Allied demands was extorted by the threat of an immediate invasion which would lead to the political disruption of the nation and its economic destruction. It involves no imputation of ill faith to any unarmed person or

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

community that they should put their name to any undertaking, however impossible to fulfilment, that is thus presented to them at the cannon's mouth. There exists neither moral nor legal obligation to carry out an undertaking thus extorted by force, even were it practically feasible. Where fulfilment is not feasible, the issue of obligation does not arise at all. Those who would understand the real significance of this latest phase of the reparation issue, must look beneath the political moves and motives to the economic bedrock.

In form the new demands are less unreasonable than those of Paris, and are in closer accordance with the treaty terms. They fix the total liability at the sum of 137 billions of gold marks (inclusive of the payment due May 1, and the Belgian debt to the Allies) or £6,850,000,000. Toward this sum Germany is estimated to have paid £100,000,000, after discharging the food credits and the costs of the armies of occupation in accordance with treaty provisions. This total, though considerably larger than the fixed part of the Paris demands (£5,500,000,000), is probably less than the Paris sum increased by the value of the indeterminate yield of the 12 per cent export duty. For though the ultimatum demands raised the export duty to 26 per cent, this adds nothing to the final aggregate, which takes the changing yield of the tax into account.

The time-distribution of the payment is in certain respects better, in others worse, than that of Paris. Germany is to deliver bonds amounting to £600,000,000 by July 1, 1921, followed by £1,900,000,000 by November, 1921. These bonds are to be issued at once to the investing public, on a 5 per cent interest basis, and Germany is to provide this interest with a sinking fund of 1 per cent in gold bonds, payable twice a year to the Allies and secured by a lien upon customs and export duties, or in default, upon all other properties of the German Government. The interest service of these two issues of bonds (amounting in all to £2,500,000,000) at 6 per cent is £150,000,000. To meet this annual charge Germany must find a regular fixed contribution of £100,000,000 *plus* 26 per cent of the total value of her exports. This export tax is thus assumed to yield at the start not less than £50,000,000, any yield in excess of that amount going to the sinking fund.

The remainder of the total sum, viz., £4,250,000,000, is to be provided by a third series of gold bonds, to be delivered next year to the Allied Governments, but only to be issued and put upon the market when the Reparation Commission decides that Germany's resources are adequate to meet the additional service of these bonds. Since there is to be no accumulation of interest in respect of this third series until it is actually issued, any reasonable view of the situation may leave out of account two-thirds of the total sum, which doubtless has a political use to pacify the popular demand for swingeing damages, but no economic significance, since the time for its ripening into actuality is unlikely ever to be reached.

The necessity for postponement of the issue of the third series of bonds is pretty obvious. Their service would at once load the annual reparation payments with an additional £300,000,000 to provide the 6 per cent interest and 1 per cent sinking fund required for their service, a truly absurd proposal.

I am of opinion that the evidence of Germany's capacity to pay will make it clear that the Commission can never declare the arrival of the time for the issue of the £4,250,000,000 bonds, and that the Allied Governments must be aware of this fact and in view of the situation have decided, while maintaining the appearance of fulfilling their pledges to secure from Germany the full damages under the treaty, to cut down their real demands to the figure, £2,500,000,000, which was the amount of Germany's alternative offer at Paris. This offer they rejected as derisory and unworthy of consideration. But though ill-formulated and not fully comprehensible in the form in which it was stated, it probably approximated to the truth in respect of Germany's capacity to pay, and the Allied reversion to this sum as the limit for their actual demands is a half-conscious testimony to the economic validity of that offer.

But though upon this hypothesis we may rule out the substance of the large postponed sum, its formal existence none the less operates very detrimentally upon the realities of reparation. The truly urgent need is the provision now of a large capital sum in order to set about without delay the reconstruction of the devastated areas. A protracted series of annual payments do not meet this need. Hence the proposal to put upon the world market the gold bonds to be paid this year by Germany to the Allies. Real reparation hinges upon the sale of these bonds in large amounts and at something like their full nominal value. Such a market in its turn depends upon the belief of the investing public in various countries, especially in America and the few other countries with funds available for such investments, that Germany can and will carry out her undertakings in respect to the service of these bonds. Now, while most men of financial experience will agree that, under renewed conditions of economic stability, and with fair access to external markets, Germany might with reasonable confidence be expected to be able to provide interest and sinking fund for a reparation of £2,500,000,000, they will refuse to entertain a proposition to provide the capital for such a fund, if there is attached to it the huge further obligation. For they will rightly judge that, whereas Germany might well exert its best energies to pay a sum that is within its compass, it will not do so, if success in that achievement is to be the test and cause for further and far larger demands upon her future energies. It may be replied, that if, as I have here argued, there is no serious expectation or intention on the part of the Allied Governments to extort this third issue, the damaging reaction on investors in the earlier issues should not arise. But everybody knows that the general investor, who is invited to assume this burden, is timid and suspicious, and that the formal existence of this large immeasurable risk is certain to operate most potently upon his timidity and suspicion in the case of an investment whose value is based upon German undertakings and assets. It is safe, therefore, to assert that no priority of claim upon the German assets for the first two issues will under these circumstances suffice to make them marketable except in small amounts and at exceedingly low prices. This will mean that the capital sums required for the early restoration of the devastated areas will not be forthcoming. Though part of this deficiency may be made up from such deliveries in kind or in labor as France may be induced to accept, the net result will be a smaller immediate yield than would have been obtained, if the large deferred portion of the indemnity had been omitted from the account.

While the fixation of the total obligation corrects the deep inherent vice of the provision under Annex II of the treaty, in which three bond issues amounting to £5,000,000,000 are treated as "a first instalment" of an unnamed illimitable total, it does not go far toward meeting the radical objection to any assessment which exceeds the reasonable capacity to pay. The smaller limited impossibility of the present aggregate sum is as disabling a factor in its bearing upon the provision for immediate restoration as the larger unlimited impossibility of Annex II under the treaty. For it does not matter how much greater one burden is than another, if you cannot in any event bear either of the two. And this is the situation of Germany.

If the demands had been confined to the two first issues, and they had been distributed over a larger period instead of being demanded within this year, it is possible that Germany might have been able to defray the expenses of their service. But while the first vice of the new demands consists in the piling on of these deferred bogus billions, the second consists in the excessive size of the immediate sums required for service of the first two issues. Although the Paris proposals, with their rapid climb to a height of some £400,000,000 per annum at the eleventh year, were more intolerable in their final incidence, the new London scheme imposes a considerably heavier load at the start. This is made manifest in the addition of a 26 per cent export duty, instead of a 12 per cent, as in the Paris terms, to the same fixed demand of £100,000,000 for the first two years. For since it is impossible that an export surplus of £100,000,000 should be provided from a total export value of less than £300,000,000, the additional duty on that amount would reach £78,000,000, making a total of £178,000,000 for the opening years. But the payment of this enlarged sum in export surplus (the only possible form of payment) must, raising that sum above £300,000,000, raise also the yield of the 26 per cent duty. Thus it is evident that the Allied demand begins at a yearly sum of nearly £200,000,000.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Now, while it is generally agreed that Germany, with her Silesian and Ruhr mines intact, and restored facilities to foreign trade, could in due course of time restore her industries to such a level as, with economy of internal administration, would enable her to pay a considerable annual sum, no one could make a reasonable case for her ability to pay at the outset a sum approaching £200,000,000 out of her immediately available resources. I am at a loss to understand how the Reparation Commission, instructed by the treaty to "consider the resources and capacity of Germany," can have advised the Allied Governments that Germany possesses an immediate power to pay these annual sums. For though the Commission "shall not be bound by any particular code or rules of law or by any particular rule of evidence or of procedure," it is to employ "trustworthy modes of computation."

As we proceed to cite the relevant facts regarding Germany's present capacity to pay, it will appear incredible that the Commission should have endeavored to apply "trustworthy modes of computation," if it is upon this advice that the Allied Governments are acting. The whole procedure of presenting these demands in the shape of an ultimatum, without even giving the German Government that "just opportunity to be heard" which Article 234 requires, reduces to the merest mockery the language of the treaty, with its grave announcement that the actions of the Commission are to be "guided by justice, equity, and good faith."

The inability of Germany to fulfil these early undertakings forced upon their acceptance is so manifest that it is impossible to suppose the Allied statesmen to be ignorant of this inability. If so, we must conclude that some of them desire the natural and necessary effect of their conduct, viz., to prepare the way for early defaults upon the part of Germany, and to keep open this running sore in the body politic of Europe in order to pursue other ends which they prefer to a reasonable settlement on reparations.

IV. CAPACITY TO PAY

The brunt of my criticism of the Allied policy on reparation turns upon the absence of any impartial investigation of Germany's capacity to pay. But the objection may be raised that, though the action of the Commission and of the Council is ex parte, their interest lies so clearly in the direction of securing the largest quantity of reparation actually attainable that it is unreasonable to impute to them a policy which kills the goose that is to lay the golden eggs. Even a partial tribunal may judge fairly, if fairness is essential to the attainment of its selfish end. This may be the plea of those who hold that Germany can pay, that she is shamming poor, and that the action of the Supreme Council is necessary to "call her bluff."

But while it may be conceded that capacity to pay is not for any nation a closely calculable sum, but one possessing a considerable elasticity, there exists a body of relevant facts and figures enabling us to reach a reasonably just estimate.

Theoretically, the capacity to pay possessed in a given year by the income of a nation consists in and is measured by the excess of that income over and above the costs of maintaining the capital and labor engaged in necessary industries and commerce, and of maintaining the necessary expenses of government. If a larger period than a single year be taken, the maximum capacity will, however, require an allowance for some saving and enlargement of capital to be made in addition to bare costs of maintenance, so that the enhanced productivity of a progressive industry may fructify in increased surplus, available for future reparation. Put otherwise, the theoretic maximum payment consists of the economic rent, surplus profits, excessive interest and salaries, the payment of which to their German recipients is not necessary in order to evoke and maintain any productive service on their part. Labor must be maintained at a level of working efficiency, capital must not be let down or discouraged from coming into being: but all income beyond these necessary payments, the surplus income of the rich and middling classes, can be taken by taxation, and, after deduction has been made for necessary costs of government, the rest can be converted into export goods for payment of reparation.

Such is the economic theory. It requires, however, several important qualifications from the practical side. No process of taxation, however searching, honest, and efficiently conducted, can secure the whole, or nearly the whole, of the theoretically attainable surplus. Every art of concealment will be employed by owners. Much of the unearned income is so closely associated with earned and necessary income as to be incapable of measurement and separation. Where properties bearing unearned or excessive incomes have been free subjects of recent transfer, at prices which discount this excess, any attack upon the present incomes they yield will arouse a passionate resentment against confiscation. In general, it is politically impracticable to effect a sudden increase of taxation beyond a certain rate, especially for such an unpopular purpose as reparation. In these and other ways the taxing power, even of the strongest and most respected state, is restricted. In the case of Germany, subjected so recently to great constitutional upheavals, it is unreasonable to expect that any Government, whether acting on its own free initiative, or still less when submitting to detailed dictation of foreign Powers, can approach the maximum surplus income through any process of taxation. The common motive, sedulously sown by the baser of the Allied statesmen, that Germany was not taxing her people as highly as some Allied countries, ought to have received its coup de grace from the report of our commercial secretaries at Berlin and Cologne to our Government last January, in which the estimate was given that the Reich and the state taxation for the current year would amount to 43 per cent of the national income. Nor is there any ground for the reckless assertion that the high taxes are not collected. In addition to the burden of their regular taxation a capital levy has been imposed, and some further indirect taxation has been announced.

Out of this higher taxation, how much can be diverted into reparation remains uncertain. Against a large reduction in military and naval expenditure must be set an enormous war-pension item, which cannot, like the internal war debt, admit either of repudiation or postponement. Moreover, though there is no public external debt to be defrayed, the aggregate indebtedness of German nationals to foreigners, the accumulation of war-advances, is very large, estimated by German officials[8] at 50 billion marks. There may be grounds for holding that Germany has abstained from reductions in some departments of her public expenditure in order to support her plea of inability to pay. But it is evident that a large proportion of her taxable capacity must be allocated to her own needs.

But whatever proportion of the surplus income (rents of junker landlords, town rents, high profits of cartels and other lucrative businesses, etc.) is obtainable by taxation, must suffer a very large deduction when it is translated into the export goods by which alone reparation can be paid. For the process I here describe is one that changes the luxurious goods and services, upon which the rich classes in Germany expended most of their "unearned" incomes, together with the unnecessary comforts of the fairly prosperous middle classes and the cheaper enjoyments of the working classes, into the sort of goods which can get marketed in foreign countries. Reflection will show that the transference can only be compassed at the cost of an enormous shrinkage in values. Concretely stated, the capital, ability, and labor which formerly went to produce goods and services of very various sorts accommodated to the luxurious or other personal requirements of different classes of the German people in their several localities, must be transferred into a comparatively restricted number of trades working for the foreign markets. Such transfer is manifestly an expensive process in itself, and can yield at first no appreciable gains, though in the process of years these export trades, fed with new supplies of labor and capital, would produce greatly enhanced quantities of those chemicals and other scientific products, standardized metal and textile wares, ships, engines, toys, and other cheap luxuries, which every Allied nation is struggling to exclude by setting up protective tariffs and other obstacles to German competition.

V. ALLIED OBSTACLES TO REPARATIONS

Enormous powers are assigned to the Reparation Commis-

[8] Memorandum on Germany's solvency for the purpose of reparation, p. 13.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

sion to determine not merely how much Germany shall pay, but in what forms payment shall be made, to decide how much foods and materials are necessary to her in the years of reconstruction, and to supervise and regulate both her taxing system and her internal public expenditure, with a view to securing that, after certain primary internal needs are satisfied, reparation shall have a first claim on the resources of the nation. These amount in effect to a right of arbitrary supervision over the entire economic system, public and private, of Germany. This power of economic supervision is confirmed by a similarly compulsory power over legislation, conveyed in Article 241 in the peremptory form that "Germany undertakes to pass, issue, and maintain in force any legislation, orders, and decrees, that may be necessary to give complete effect to those provisions," the "necessity" to be determined by the Reparation Commission.

It may, of course, be argued that no detriment is likely to occur to the economy of Germany by the exercise of any such powers of interference, however wide, because it is obviously to the interest of the Allies, as recipients of reparation, so to exercise these powers as to enable Germany to attain such industrial, commercial, and financial efficiency as would facilitate such payment.

There are, however, two faults in such an argument. The first is a fault of ignorance and incompetency. Outside interference with the delicate mechanism of national industry and public finance is certain to be injurious, however well-intentioned it might be. The second is the danger that the supposed interest, true or false, of one or other of the Allied states, or their nationals, would continually deflect the control of the Commission from its primary and avowed purpose, that of getting reparation. This injurious tendency is admittedly responsible for many of the treaty provisions which cripple Germany's industrial and commercial recovery. A report from the Port, Waterways, and Railways Commission to the Supreme Council on June 9, 1918, in reply to the German claim for immediate reciprocity, cites two reasons for refusal. The first is that non-reciprocity for a limited period is desirable in order to prevent Germany from profiting from the devastation and ruin for which she was responsible. The second, closely related to the first, is the need to provide against the danger lest the land-locked states which had gained their economic independence should fall once again under the economic tutelage of Germany.[9]

Other motives are assigned by the Powers for their political and economic policy in the Saar, and for non-reciprocal conditions in the matter of commercial exchanges. The Saar policy is defended not merely as "a security for reparation," but as "a definite and exemplary retribution" (i.e., for the destruction of French mines), while commercial non-reciprocity is "a measure of reparation" due to "a consideration of justice."[10] Such "punishment," it is urged, is "a conception which is essential to any just settlement."

The fullest avowal of this policy is contained in the reply of the Allied and Assembled Powers, June 16, 1918,[11] directed to answer the German plea for the fulfilment of President Wilson's third "Point," viz., "The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance." This reply contends, first, that non-reciprocity and inequality for "a transitory period" does not really violate this point, inasmuch as the war has left certain nations in a temporary state of feebleness. Equality requires a recognition of the existing differences of economic strength and industrial integrity of the peoples of Europe. Wilson's requirement must, therefore, involve that Germany shall temporarily be deprived of the right she claims to be treated on a basis of complete equality with other nations. "The illegal acts of the enemy have placed many of the Allied states in a position of economic inferiority to Germany." "For such countries a certain freedom of action during the period of transition is vitally necessary. It is therefore a consideration for justice which has led the . . . Powers to impose on Germany, for a minimum period of four years, non-reciprocal conditions in the matter of commercial exchanges."[12] In a word, "it is only justice that restitution should be made, and that these wronged peoples should be safeguarded for a time from the competition of a nation whose industries are intact."[13]

The economic clauses of the treaty are permeated with these motives of punitive justice and provisions against the too rapid recovery of Germany's industry and commerce.

The full bearing of this upon the economic policy of reparation is, however, best understood when it is related to the commercial and fiscal conduct of the several Allied nations after the armistice and the peace. That conduct, in accordance with the resolutions adopted by the Economic Conference at Paris in 1916, is applied, partly by legislation, partly by administrative discretion, to a policy gravely detrimental to the economic recovery of Germany, and particularly to her capacity for reparation. It is in general a graded policy of exclusion, by which each nation (1) protects its home industries against foreign competition from any source, while, by its colonial administration, it monopolizes the trade and raw materials of the empire; (2) by particular agreements with certain Allies, gives more favorable terms to the imports of their goods and a participation in the probable development of oil and other natural resources in mandatory or other subject territories; (3) imposes a protective tariff upon a higher level against imports from minor allies and neutrals; (4) directs special measures of discrimination or exclusion against important classes of German imports, accompanied by numerous disabilities or prohibitions upon their traders and settlers, and their business undertakings in allied countries and their possessions, protectorates, or mandatory areas.

The different Allies have taken different measures for developing this policy, but with the same general purpose and the same result, that of placing strong barriers against the resumption of profitable trade by Germany. The fact that linked with this purpose is the wider one of conserving, each its own national resources and markets for its own nationals, only serves to emphasize the destructive nature of the whole trade policy.

The truth is that the problem of reparation has focused more powerfully than ever before the antagonism between the two conceptions of international trade, that which regards it as the widest form of that cooperation by division and specialization of labor which affords the greatest yield of wealth to the entire community and its particular members, and that which sees in it a conflict of activities and interests by which the members of one nation may, through governmental action, benefit themselves at the cost of another nation.

All the reasoning adduced to support the various provisions for reparation in kind, non-reciprocity, forcible intervention in the economic administration of Germany, restrictions on her import and export trade, uprooting her foreign settlements and confiscation of her foreign resources, is subject to this common reprobation, that it assumes a fundamentally false conception of the nature of international economic relations.

It is, of course, true that some of the motives adduced for certain of these hostile measures are avowedly non-commercial, being punitive, compensatory, or merely precautionary. But in these cases it is never realized that the indulgence of each of these motives must be paid for in terms of reduced productivity of Germany, and therefore in reduced capacity for reparation. It is not realized that each blow struck at the enemy through these acts of peace recoils upon the striker.

All these provisions are recognized by economists in every country to be commercially unsound in their bearing upon Germany's capacity to pay and upon Europe's general capacity for economic recovery. One aspect of the complicated folly is, indeed, drilling its way into the intelligence of many members of the Allied peoples, viz., the flat contradiction between the policy of demanding a huge unnamed indemnity and the policy of keeping out the German goods, by which alone the payment of any indemnity is possible. When this education has gone further, it will expose the similar folly of all the other interferences with the revival of German industry and commerce.

If the Allies had from the first been animated by the clear

[9] "History of the Peace Conference," vol. ii, p. 99.
[10] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 400, also pp. 279-389. [11] *Ibid.*, p. 320.
[12] *Ibid.*, vol. ii, p. 322. [13] *Ibid.*, p. 376.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

dominant purpose of setting the German people to work at once under conditions enabling them to make the largest and the earliest reparation for the injuries they had inflicted, the economic policy they would have adopted would have been as follows: Recognizing that, from 1916 onward, the working population of the country had been underfed, that all industries dependent on outside raw materials had been starved, that its transport had been grievously impaired, that its credit for external purchases was wellnigh depleted, they would have striven in every way to restore the fabric of its industry and the transport system, to repair its damaged agriculture, to build up by large food supplies the economic efficiency of the population, and to furnish such additional credit as was required to make the necessary external purchases until the normal machinery of exchange was restored. Having in view these essentials of recovery, they would have been careful to secure (1) that the political and territorial changes which they made should be accompanied by as little disturbance as possible of former economic relations between the severed parts, and that, in particular, political severance should entail no fiscal or transport barriers; (2) that, having regard to the fact that every European nation was more or less suffering from a shortage of food, fuel, raw materials, machinery, and manufactured goods, the provisions of the treaties and the post-war policy should be directed to secure for all nations the utmost freedom of importation and exportation consistent with sumptuary regulations. The intrusion of motives hostile to this sound economy, whether protectionist, fiscal, imperialist, punitive, or predatory, has made the collective and social policy of the Allies one of economic strangulation.

VI. THE EXPORT SURPLUS

Having regard to the loss of territory and of internal and external resources to which she has been subjected, and to the various other restrictions, prohibitions, and disabilities contained in the peace treaties and the post-war policy, what is the reasonable amount of reparation Germany should be asked to pay, and how should it be distributed in time? Or, alternatively, given such revision of the treaty and of the Allied policy as will, so far as possible, remove these obstacles and disabilities, what amount of reparation might be got under these improved conditions?

Starting from the two admitted premises that, before any capacity for reparation exists, the necessary livelihood of the German population must be assured, and that it is undesirable to extend the period during which reparation is paid beyond thirty years, we soon reach the governing condition of our inquiry, viz., the admission that the reparation must be paid in terms of the surplus of export over import trade, an annual payment. The acknowledgment of this time-limit carries this important implication. It rules out the acquisition by foreigners of any large ownership of property in Germany as a mode of reparation. For such ownership, were it not canceled before a generation had elapsed, would involve what would amount to a continuation of the payment of reparation beyond that period. Therefore, however desirable it may be that Germany's early capacity to pay should be facilitated and increased by the temporary mortgage of her capital resources to foreigners, such advances should not form a permanent burden upon the German population. This serves to enforce the central thesis that the amount of German reparation must be presented in terms of annual export surpluses.

Now Germany's foreign trade, on an average of the five years ending 1913, showed an excess of imports over visible exports to the extent of £74,000,000. This import surplus was balanced by means of interest upon existing foreign securities, profits of shipping, foreign banking, trading, etc., the sum of which exceeded this balance, allowing a considerable sum for further foreign investments. The whole of these "invisible exports" having, however, been destroyed by the terms of the peace and the post-war Allied policy, Germany's pre-war foreign commerce, were it otherwise completely resumable, could furnish no surplus whatever for reparation. On the contrary, so far from having an export surplus she would have a deficit, unable to pay for what she sought to buy. This deficit would be enhanced by the fact that the war has converted Germany from being a creditor nation, having annual interest to receive from foreigners, into a debtor nation having annual interest to pay. From the beginning of the war to February, 1920, it has been estimated[14] that the balance of imports over exports amounts to about 60 billion marks, and that after allowing for the payment of 4½ billions by export of gold, and 5.6 billions by sale of securities, a total foreign debt of some 50 billions remains to be financed out of the annual income of the country. Whatever allowance be made for exaggeration in this German estimate, it remains true that in order to make any payment to the Allies she must either greatly increase her exports or reduce her imports, or do both.

Now how far do the new economic conditions enable her to perform successfully either of these processes?

An analysis of Germany's import trade for 1913[15] shows that it consisted to the extent of 35.3 per cent of raw materials for manufacture of articles for domestic use or for export, 28.3 per cent of foodstuffs, for the most part cereals, oils, cattle, and other necessary foods, while 3.9 per cent consisted of semi-manufactured textiles and machinery. Of the remaining 32.5 per cent the great bulk consisted either of articles of consumption, contributing to the subsistence and working efficiency of the German people, or of capital goods serviceable for the production of such necessaries or of export goods. In other words, no large percentage of imports consisted of luxuries or other non-productive consumption, the only part of import trade that could be dispensed with advantageously. Assume that 10 per cent of the 1913 imports could be thus ranked as "unproductive," the reduction would amount in pre-war values to some £53,000,000, or in post-war gold values to £90,000,000.

Now turn to the export side in order to consider how exports can be increased. In 1913 not less than 27.7 per cent of the export consisted of iron goods, machinery, and coal. The loss of territory supplying three-quarters of her iron ore, 38 per cent of her blast-furnaces, 9 per cent of her foundries, 9 per cent of her coal mines, and the coal payments under the Spa Agreement (or 32 per cent if Upper Silesia goes to Poland), must greatly diminish her capacity for exporting this class of goods, as well as others in which coal and iron enter largely as costs of production. If, as is contended sometimes, Germans will be able to buy coal and iron from other countries to make up these losses, the necessity of paying for such external supplies in more export goods only transfers, and does not lighten, the difficulty. Next in importance to iron and coal come cotton and woolen goods, comprising 11.5 per cent in 1913, leather, sugar, paper, furs, electrical goods, dyes, copper goods, toys, rubber and rubber goods, books, maps and music, potash, glass, potassium chloride, pianos, organs and parts, raw zinc, porcelain. These compose in all two-thirds of the export values. They fall in the main into three classes: (1) essential goods, based upon superior scientific processes; (2) cheap standardized metal and textile goods; (3) luxury and artistic goods. What are the prospects of a greatly increased export trade in any of these classes, under such conditions as to earn a large gold income? Will the Allied countries, who took so large a share of these exports before the war, increase their purchase? Apart from the general reluctance of their populations to buy any goods from Germany, the fiscal policies of most of the Allies are directed against the admission into their markets of each of those three classes. Britain, for example, has passed legislation designed to keep out most important items of Class I as "key industries" and large sections of Class II as "dumped goods," while both her general protective and her sumptuary policy must tend to cut down Class III to the narrowest dimensions. A small proportion of Germany's pre-war export trade consisted of articles made exclusively from German materials (therefore involving no increased import trade), and not exposed to the above objections.[16]

The entire medley of the Allied post-war policy, peace terms, tariffs, embargoes and prohibitions, unnamed reparation, has, in a word, contributed to reduce the export power of Germany, thus disabling her for reparation. For, quite apart from the obstacles thus placed in the way of production, transport, and

[14] Memorandum on Germany's solvency for the purpose of reparation, p. 12.
[15] Cf. Keynes's "Economic Consequences of the Peace," pp. 190-2.
[16] Cf. "History," vol. ii, p. 50, for a computation of the pre-war surplus of exports.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

marketing of export goods, the low, fluctuating, and unpredictable exchange, which these conditions have helped to bring about, has a constricting influence on her export trade. The fatuity of the Allied attitude toward reparation reaches its zenith in the tariff regulations taken by their respective governments to correct the effect of the bad exchange of Germany in enabling her exporters to pour cheap-priced goods into their markets. For, first, in default of the free export of gold (now out of the question), such flows of goods are the only possible way in which a bad exchange can be corrected. Secondly, they are the only way in which reparation can be provided. Reparation in terms of German labor was refused by France after elaborate provisions had actually been drafted for its provision in the Versailles Treaty, and though the new London scheme reverts to the idea, it is tolerably certain that French labor will be strong enough to stop any large contribution from this source. Germany's other proposal in 1919 to give payment in the shape of investments in German industrial enterprises was also refused by the Allies, "because," according to Mr. Dulles, "it was regarded as a device to insure the Allied peoples becoming so bound up in the internal affairs of Germany and so sympathetic toward the prompt economic revival and prosperity of Germany that the Allied Governments would be embarrassed in their political relations with Germany."[17] But in any case, as I have pointed out, the real reparation thus furnished must take shape in the German exports representing interest on their investments.

Since the German reparation is made in gold marks, it might have been supposed that the lower the prices at which, owing to the bad exchange, German goods could pour into Allied markets, the greater the quantity of real reparation. The chief aim and result, therefore, of the duty in our recent tariff act upon goods entering our markets from countries of low exchange, is by raising the price and reducing the quantity of German goods imported into our country, to diminish the real reparation as much as possible. By pursuing this policy far enough, and by cooperation with our Allies, we should enable Germany to pay the total reparation in the smallest quantity of real wealth, though necessarily spread over the longest period of years.

This, indeed, may be described as "the logic" of the Allied policy on reparations, the resultant of the two sets of forces, one making for the largest and most impossible demands for payment in gold marks, the other for the refusal to receive the only sorts of goods by which these gold marks can be earned.

To this impasse, however, there is a further contribution from the same source. The refusal to enable Germany to correct the bad exchange by her large export trades continues to disable her from buying ahead the raw materials which she must require in increasing quantities for the performance of her reparation task in the only way it can be performed. Any impartial observer of the situation would undoubtedly conclude from the accumulation of obstacles set in the only path of reparation that the Allied Governments wished to receive from Germany the least possible amount of reparation.

Any close consideration of the specific reactions of the Allied post-war policy upon German productivity in general strengthens this analysis of her export disabilities. The effective supplies of labor, capital, business ability, science, and intellectual equipment, all vital elements in productivity, have all sustained heavy damages through the war, the blockade, the peace terms, and the post-war economic policy of the Allies. A people, reduced in number by some nine millions through loss of territory, the remainder reduced in number by the loss of some two millions slain and another million permanently disabled, the entire working population damaged in vitality and working efficiency by privations which will sap the productivity of the rising generation—such are the heavy losses of the productive power of labor. Even graver are the damages inflicted on the brain-workers, upon whose efficiency the burden of industrial progress chiefly rests. Not merely have the professional, artistic, and intellectual classes sustained, as individuals, economic damages to their standard of living that have impaired their productive powers, but the public insolvency threatens to destroy the collective foundations of education and of culture. Business enterprise and initiative are deprived of their necessary stimuli: personal economy, thrift, saving for the maintenance and improvement of the capital structure of industry are all alike inhibited by a sense of insecurity about the future and the fear lest successful industry may merely serve to swell the volume of indemnity.

This combination of concrete obstacles with psychological deterrents, all operating through degraded currency to paralyze effective recovery and progress of German industry and commerce, renders it impossible that the total yield of German real income should be such as to furnish the requisite surplus of exports to pay a large gold mark reparation, after the prior charges for the necessary provision for the maintenance of its population, the upkeep of its Government, and the cost of the armies of occupation have been taken into account.

In concluding this analysis of the problem of reparation, specific reference must be made to what may be called "the state of mind" of Germany in its distinctively economic bearing. The frequently expressed judgment of Allied spokesmen that the German people ought to recognize their sole responsibility for the war and to feel a keen sense of penitence, coupled with a desire to make a reparation on the score of justice, need not here be discussed in relation to its objective truth. It must suffice to say that there is not the least likelihood of the German people accepting as effective incentives toward reparation any such judgment. On the contrary, it is natural that, as the Allies dwell upon the guilt and cruelty of Germany in the causation and conduct of the war, Germans should see in that war a policy of their enemies carried into consummation in the guilt and cruelty of the peace. These sentiments, justified or not, must exercise a depressing influence upon the processes of economic recuperation, inducing in the more sensitive sections of the population a feeling either of futile irritability or sheer torpor, and in either case a lowering of moral energy exceedingly injurious to productive effort.

The aggregate effect of these considerations upon the solution of the problem of reparation cannot be expressed in any quantitative terms. But it is indisputably true that the net effect of these injurious influences upon current German productivity and foreign commerce, if maintained, is such that no substantial reparation can be made, except by methods (e.g., the forcible removal of coal, gold, etc.) which, in order to effect some small immediate payment, let down injuriously the subsistence of the population and impair the recovery and progress of the economic system of the country.

The only way in which any substantial reparation can be got is by adopting a policy expressly directed to restore Germany as soon and as completely as possible to the highest pitch of productivity and the fullest liberty of foreign trade to which her injured and diminished natural and human resources are capable of attaining. If some of the mischief cannot be undone, every effort should be made to repair the disabilities.

This sound policy of reparation would involve:

1. Cancelment of all the injurious clauses in the economic and financial sections of the treaty, as well as in those provisions of the reparation section, to which we have referred.

2. A removal of all prohibitions, discriminations, and other restrictions upon the transport and foreign trade between Germany and other countries imposed by the post-war policy of the several Allies.

3. The provision of such positive assistance in the shape of transport, coal, and credit as would enable the German people to restore their damaged industry and set their internal and external finances upon such a footing as would conduce to the highest productivity and the largest export trade with the greatest celerity.

4. The removal of the entire issue from the ex-parte judgment of the Supreme Council and the Commission to an impartial Commission of Neutrals, with a view to the fixation as soon as possible of such a sum of reparation as under these improved circumstances it is reasonably estimated Germany can afford to pay within a generation, without letting down the population and the future productivity, and such as the Allies can afford to receive without injurious reaction upon their economic system.

[17] Address in New York, March 12, 1921.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED